United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/28/JPN/1

General Assembly

Distr.: General
31 August 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-eighth session
6–17 November 2017

National report submitted in accordance with paragraph 5 of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 16/21*

Japan

* The present document has been reproduced as received. Its content does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations.

GE.17-15204(E)

1715204

Please recycle

Contents

I. Process for the preparation of the national report
A. Introduction
B. Methodology
C. Follow-ups in Japan (recommendation 169)
D. Discussion between organizations and consultation with civil society
II. Follow-up actions in line with UPR recommendations from the previous cycle
A. Fully implemented measures
B. Measures partially implemented
C. Other measures
III. Status of implementation of voluntary pledges
A. Cooperation for the United Nations
B. Contribution to the international community
C. Hosting WAW! (World Assembly for Women)
IV. Progress and challenges in addressing new and emerging issues (Efforts to achieve the SDGs) ....

age
3
3
3
3
3
4
4
12
14
17
17
17
18
19

I. Process for the preparation of the national report

A. Introduction

1. Upholding the high standards of human rights enshrined and guaranteed in its Constitution, Japan has consolidated its democratic political system and has developed policies for the protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms as universal values. The Government of Japan (GOJ) welcomes the 3rd cycle of the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) as an opportunity to report the progress status of human rights protection and promotion in Japan.

B. Methodology

2. The GOJ has prepared the Third National Report by Japan for the UPR in line with the guidelines, including resolutions and decisions adopted by the Human Rights Council (A/HRC/RES/16/21 and A/HRC/DEC/17/119) as well as with the 3rd cycle UPR guidance note on national report. The Report focuses on, inter alia, the implementation of the 125 recommendations in the annex which Japan accepted to the follow-up during the 2nd cycle in 2012, and on developments in Japan's human rights situation such as contributions to the international community, including the promotion of women's rights, and initiatives to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The Report shows the recommendation numbers as subheadings.

C. Follow-ups in Japan (recommendation 169)

3. It is vital for the UPR that each country takes voluntary follow-up action in order to continue further improving its human rights situation. Therefore, giving serious consideration to the outcome of its own UPR session of October 2012, the GOJ, prior to the submission of this Report, translated the outcome documents of the 2nd cycle of the UPR in 2012 containing recommendations and other findings into Japanese and made available on the website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) to make them well-known to the general public. Further, the GOJ voluntarily published the follow-up status in February 2017.

D. Discussion between organizations and consultation with civil society

4. The preparation of the report has been coordinated by MOFA with the involvement of a number of ministries and agencies, including the following: the Cabinet Secretariat; the Cabinet Office; the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC); the Ministry of Justice (MOJ); the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT); the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW); the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT); and the National Police Agency (NPA). Furthermore, the GOJ held a dialogue session in which we exchanged views with the public and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on March 28, 2017 at MOFA. The GOJ also collected opinions on this Report from the public through the MOFA website to engage civil society in this preparation process. To provide information about the dialogue and collect opinions, the GOJ utilized social media, including MOFA's Facebook and Twitter feeds.

5. The GOJ ensures that it offers various opportunities for dialogues with civil society by attending consultations held by private organizations, receiving requests by private organizations regarding the current measures, and holding dialogue and public comment sessions in the course of preparing government reports on the human rights treaties, such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), and the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (ICPPED). The GOJ will continue to attach importance to such dialogues with civil society including NGOs and continue these practices.

II. Follow-up actions in line with UPR recommendations from the previous cycle

6. In line with the resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council (see Paragraph 2), Chaptert II states the status of efforts made by the GOJ and the progress of the follow-up actions regarding especially UPR recommendations from the previous cycle on which the GOJ accepted to follow up.

A. Fully implemented measures

1. Conclusion of human rights treaties and others

7. Japan concluded the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (hereafter "ICESCR"), and the rights in the covenant are already ensured by the Constitution of Japan and the relevant laws in force in Japan.

8. Japan ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (recommendations 1, 2, 16, 17, 18, 19) in January 2014. The convention entered into force in Japan on February 19, 2014.

9. Japan concluded the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (hereafter "the Hague Convention") (recommendations 27, 28, 30) in January 2014. The Act for the Implementation of the Hague Convention was enforced in April 2014, when the Hague Convention entered into force for Japan. As of July 1, 2017, the Japanese Central Authority (i.e., the MOFA) has received 249 applications for assistance under the Hague Convention.

The Palermo Convention and the Trafficking in Persons Protocol (Recommendations 24, 25, 26)

10. Japan signed the *United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (the Palermo Convention) in December 2000 and the Diet approved its conclusion in May 2003. Japan also signed the *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime* (Trafficking in Persons Protocol), in December 2002, and the Diet approved its conclusion in June 2005. On July 11, 2017, the bill to fulfill the obligations of the Palermo Convention came into force, thus Japan concluded the Convention and the Protocol and became a State party to them on the same day. Furthermore, human trafficking was criminalized through the amendment of the Penal Code in 2005.

2. Prevention of any forms of discrimination and elimination of any discriminatory provisions (human rights education and training included)

11. Regarding the prevention of any forms of discrimination and the elimination of any discriminatory provisions (recommendations 63 and 65), the Japanese Constitution forbids any irrational discrimination. Article 14, Paragraph 1 of the Constitution states, "All of the people are equal under the law and there shall be no discrimination in political, economic or social relations because of race, creed, sex, social status or family origin." Based on this Article, Japan has been making efforts to eliminate all forms of discrimination. In the areas which are highly public and closely related with civil life such as employment, education, medical care and transportation, discriminatory treatment is prohibited by the relevant laws and regulations. Other than such fields, the human rights bodies of the MOJ as well as other related ministries and agencies take measures such as giving guidance and promoting awareness to eliminate all forms of discrimination. (see Chapter II, A, 3 and 4, paragraphs 17-59).

Human rights education and training for public servants (recommendations 114 and 115)

12. In Japan, the GOJ provides the following meticulous human rights training for public servants taking into consideration the rights of women and children, thereby acquiring a full understanding of the principles of international human rights treaties.

13. The MIC provided biannual human rights education sessions for local public officers during FY (Fiscal Year) 2015 and FY2016. The MEXT held a meeting for members of prefectural boards of education in charge of human rights education and other relevant people to help improve human rights education at schools.

14. Police schools provide human rights education for newly employed or promoted police personnel. Police stations and other relevant locations also give their police personnel human rights education on various occasions, including on-the-job training. The police plan to continue these actions.

15. The MOJ provides lectures on human rights that encompass women's and children's rights as part of various training programs for public prosecutors. For officials at correctional institutions, the MOJ provides training on knowledge and skills needed to conduct adequate treatment with respect for human rights. Officials at rehabilitation offices participate in training programs provided according to their number of years of experience. The programs for probation officers include lectures on human rights of crime victims as well as of probationers and parolees, while those for rehabilitation coordinators provide lectures on human rights of crime victims and those under medical treatment and supervision. The Immigration Bureau carries out training courses for relevant officials based on their years of experience, including lectures on human rights, and courses specialized in matters such as measures to combat trafficking in persons and human rights for mid-ranking officials who deal directly with such cases, in cooperation with external instructors from relevant government ministries and agencies, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the International Organization for Migration (IOM).

16. The MOJ also provides a biannual workshop for national public officers to deepen their understanding and knowledge of human rights issues. Furthermore, it holds a human rights workshop for local public officers working in bureaus responsible for human rights promotional administration three times a year.

3. Rights of specific types of people and groups

17. The human rights bodies of the MOJ provide counseling on a wide range of human rights issues including ones pertaining to women, children and persons with disabilities.

When they become aware of a suspected human rights violation, the bodies investigate without delay and take appropriate measures depending on the case. In addition, the bodies conduct various awareness-raising activities such as holding lectures and workshops and distributing promotional brochures and leaflets to ensure that the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities are respected.

(a) Persons with disabilities (recommendations 86, 87, 88, 153)

18. Japan ratified the CRPD in January 2014. In line with the Basic Act for Persons with Disabilities revised in 2011 based on the spirit of this Convention, the GOJ drew up the Basic Programme for Persons with Disabilities (Third) in 2013 to promote in a comprehensive and systematic manner measures for supporting the independence and social participation of persons with disabilities.

19. The Act for Eliminating Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities was enacted in June 2013 and took effect in April 2016. Administrative organizations and the private businesses sector have been taking relevant actions in accordance with the Act, such as prohibiting unfair discriminatory treatment and providing reasonable accommodation.

20. The human rights bodies of the MOJ have established permanent and ad-hoc human rights counseling centers that provide counseling on human rights issues including discrimination against persons with disabilities. The bodies also conduct various awareness-raising activities to ensure that the rights of persons with disabilities are respected.

21. To ensure hygiene at schools for children with disabilities (recommendation 153), the GOJ sets environmental hygiene standards for schools that should be followed by all schools including schools with special needs. The GOJ also takes such necessary measures as advising school founders to maintain proper environments that meet these standards.

(b) Women (recommendations 33, 62, 66–73, 75–77, 83, 127–130, 138, 151, 152)

22. In December 2015, the GOJ formulated the Fourth Basic Plan for Gender Equality, a five year plan, and is striving for the promotion and protection of the human rights of women, gender equality and the promotion of a gender-equal society.

23. Regarding the applicability of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women to the domestic legal system (recommendation 33), Article 98, Paragraph 2 of the Constitution of Japan states, "The treaties concluded by Japan and established laws of nations shall be faithfully observed." Therefore, the GOJ has enacted and revised domestic laws necessary to comply with the obligations under the Convention, and has implemented related policies. (See Chapter III, C for the World Assembly for Women: WAW!)

Supporting and protecting survivors of violence against women (recommendations 68, 71, 73, 76, 127, 128, 130, 138)

24. The Fourth Basic Plan for Gender Equality deals with "eliminating all forms of violence against women" as one of its focus areas. It specifies that Japan will deal with increasingly diversifying forms of violence against women and make more rigorous efforts to eliminate all types of such violence.

25. The Cabinet Office sets the period from November 12 through November 25 (the UN "International Day for the Elimination of Violence against Women") as the annual "Campaign for Eliminating Violence against Women" period, and through the cooperation of the government, local governments, women's groups and other related organizations, awareness raising activities and initiatives to combat violence against women are further strengthened during this period. To allow foreigners experiencing harm to swiftly access

relief and protection, the Cabinet Office has produced information materials for foreign victims and delivered them to related entities, and published a homepage with information for foreign victims in several foreign languages. Additionally, ongoing initiatives include placing staff who can consult in foreign languages at Spousal Violence Counseling and Support Centers. Furthermore the Cabinet Office sends advisors to municipalities planning to establish a Spousal Violence Counseling and Support Center, and promotes their establishment. Additionally, to build up a system that allows victims of sexual crimes and others to report their cases without hesitation and safely receive consultation and support, training is provided to civil servants supporting sexual crime victims and others at local governments, and support staff at support organizations for sexual crime victims and others.

26. To harshly deal with sex crimes, the Penal Code was amended in June 2017. Before the amendment, the offense of rape, which imposes heavier statutory penalty than that of forcible indecency, was applied only to vaginal intercourse, and oral intercourse or anal intercourse was punishable only by the offense of forcible indecency. Under the amended Code, oral intercourse and anal intercourse are punishable by the offense of rape. And also the minimum statutory penalty of the offense of rape has been raised to imprisonment for not less than five years.

27. Furthermore, under the amended Code, a prosecutor can indict the sex offender without a complaint by the victim, which eases victim's burden.

28. Via its Victims of Crime Support Line and its offices, the Japan Legal Support Center provides information on legal systems and consultation centers supporting victims of crime and refers to lawyers with experience and knowledge of victim support.

29. The Immigration Bureau has established its own measures regarding cases of domestic violence and when a victim of domestic violence is recognized, the Immigration Bureau makes every effort to protect the victim by making an appropriate response according to their mental and physical condition, bearing in mind that the victim is experiencing harsh conditions, and cooperates with relevant organizations.

30. In Japan, the Anti-Stalking Act was revised to enable the police to take administrative and criminal measures more quickly against perpetrators, and came into force in 2017. The police established the cross-functional system to deal with cases such as domestic violence and stalking with the highest priority to ensure the safety of victims. Furthermore, the police also make efforts to create an environment in which victims can easily get help such as counseling by female personnel. As a result, in 2016, the police handled 69,908 consultation cases and cleared 8,387cases relating to domestic violence, respectively the highest numbers since the Act on the Prevention of Spousal Violence and the Protection of Victims came into force in 2001. In addition, the police make great efforts to facilitate smooth communication with foreign victims by bearing accommodation fees for hotels and other facilities so that victims can take temporary shelter from perpetrators and by providing multi-language materials that explain procedures to ensure their safety.

Wage Gap and Inclusion of Women in Decision-Making Processes (recommendations 151 and 152)

31. To reduce the gender pay gap, it is crucial to create an environment in which women can balance work with family life so that they feel comfortable continuing to pursue their careers. The GOJ will proceed further with the efforts to achieve the following in line with the Intensive Policy to Accelerate the Empowerment of Women 2016: improved working conditions for women in non-regular employment; eliminating long working hours; more people taking childcare leave; better support for parenting, long-term care and housework to reduce to zero the numbers of children on waiting lists for nurseries and the numbers of

women who leave their jobs for long-term care; no harassment in any forms targeted at pregnancy, childbirth, or childcare leave.

32. The Fourth Basic Plan for Gender Equality lays out the goal, "increasing the share of women in leadership positions to at least 30% by 2020 in all fields of society," and the GOJ has set numerical targets to reach that target as a whole by expanding the participation of women in all areas, including politics, the judiciary, the executive branch, and economics through promoting effective positive action, and continues to make efforts based on that plan.

33. The Act on Promotion of Women's Participation and Advancement in the Workplace has been fully enforced since April 2016. This Act mandates the national and local government organizations as well as private businesses with 301 or more employees to draw up and publish action plans that include numerical targets, and to publish information about achievements by women employees.

34. By encouraging these entities to "visualize" women's achievements through the publication of the information on their websites in accordance with the Act, the GOJ aims to urge these organizations and businesses to actively take the initiative in helping women work in a wider range of fields in society.

(c) Children (recommendations 38, 41, 60, 62, 78–82, 139–142, 154)

35. The human rights bodies of the MOJ have established permanent and ad-hoc human rights counseling centers across the country that provide counseling on human rights issues. The bodies have enhanced counseling systems for children in particular, such as setting up the toll-free "Children's Rights Hotline" counseling call service, distributing "Children's Rights SOS Mini Letters"[1] to children in elementary and junior high schools across the country, and establishing "Children's Rights SOS E-mail," which is an Internet-based human rights counseling service. The bodies also conduct various awareness-raising activities to ensure that the rights of children are respected.

36. Regarding criminalizing the possession of child pornographic materials (recommendations 41 and 82), the Act on Regulation and Punishment of Acts Relating to Child Prostitution and Child Pornography, and the Protection of Children was revised on June 18, 2014 to criminalize the possession of child pornography for the purpose of satisfying personal sexual curiosity with a penalty of up to one year of imprisonment or a fine of up to ¥1,000,000. The Act came into effect on July 15, 2015, and the police made 73 arrests for the possession of child pornography for personal sexual purposes by the end of 2016.

37. To deal with sexual exploitation of children (recommendations 139, 140, 141, 142), the GOJ drew up the Basic Plan on Measures against Child Sexual Exploitation in April 2017 to combat sexual exploitation of children, child pornography and prostitution. The Basic Plan includes measures to provide child victims of these crimes with prompt protection and proper support. In line with this Plan, the relevant ministries and agencies work with institutions and organizations dealing with these issues to create an environment in which child victims of the crimes feel safe to seek help, and to provide continuous support for these child victims. The police provide continuous support to child victims through counseling by personnel who get advice from specialists such as psychiatrists. Furthermore, the police have strengthened crackdowns on crimes related to sexual

[1] Children's Rights SOS Mini Letters: pre-stamped and addressed sealable postcards on which children can write any concerns they may have. The letters are sent to a Legal Affairs Bureau or District Legal Affairs Bureau which then contacts the sender upon receipt.

exploitation of children, which resulted in what was the highest number yet of 2,097 cleared cases relating to child pornography as well as 809 cleared cases for child prostitution in 2016. Moreover, the police have actively taken measures such as quick requests to webmasters for deletion to prevent distribution and browsing of child pornography. Prosecutors impose severe punishments for crimes related to sexual exploitation of children in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Furthermore, in response to inquiries from victims, the Japan Legal Support Center provides information on legal systems and consultation centers supporting victims in multiple languages regardless of nationality etc. The MEXT provides training on how to offer psychological support for children who have suffered abuse, including sexual abuse, for teachers and staff at elementary schools and junior and senior high schools.

38. Under the amended Penal Code, the offense of indecency by guardian and the offense of sexual intercourse by guardian have been newly established. When a guardian takes advantage of his/her influence over a child who is under 18 years of age, and commits an indecent act upon or sexual intercourse with the child, the offenses can be punished in the same manner as rape or forcible indecency, even if he/she does not use violence or threat.

39. Moreover before the amendment of the Code, victim of rape was limited to female, and male could only be a victim of forcible indecency. Under the amended Code, such gender requirement is eliminated. Therefore, a person who commits sexual intercourse (including oral intercourse or anal intercourse) with a boy can be punished by the offense of rape.

40. Appropriate education on reproductive and sexual health education in schools (recommendation 154) is provided as part of schools' overall educational activities, considering the children's developmental stages. Schools prepare and distribute educational materials that comprehensively illustrate health issues for students, including sexually transmitted diseases, pregnancy, and childbearing.

41. In connection with the efforts to review the systems applicable to children born out of wedlock (recommendations 38, 78, 79, 80, 81), after the Japanese Supreme Court's decision in September 2013, the civil law was partially revised in December of the same year so that the statutory shares in inheritance for children born out of wedlock were made equal to those for children born in wedlock. The conditions for acquiring Japanese nationality/citizenship at birth are provided in Article 2 of the Nationality Act of Japan; the conditions for acquiring Japanese nationality/citizenship through registration are provided in Article 3 and Article 17 paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 of the same Act; and the conditions for acquiring Japanese nationality/citizenship by naturalization are provided in Article 4 of the same Act, and Article 5 provides minimum conditions for naturalization. In any of the cases above, there is no discrimination between children born in wedlock and children born out of wedlock in the application of the aforementioned conditions. Articles 25 and 49 of the Family Register Act of Japan stipulate the registration of birth of a child, and these provisions do not discriminate against children based on the fact that they were born out of wedlock or based on their parents' status of residence.

(d) Measures to combat trafficking in persons (recommendations 131, 133–137)

42. The GOJ formulated *Japan's 2014 Action Plan to Combat Trafficking in Persons* in December 2014. In line with the Action Plan, relevant administrative bodies work closely by, among others, holding *the Council for the Promotion of Measures to Combat Trafficking in Persons* comprised of Cabinet Ministers of relevant ministries. Also, by strengthening cooperation with relevant foreign institutions, international organizations and NGOs, the GOJ promotes prevention, eradication and proper victim protection of trafficking in persons.

43. The GOJ provides repatriation assistance through the IOM for foreign trafficking victims identified in Japan. Furthermore, with help from the victims' countries of origin, Japan also provides social reintegration assistance for these victims after their repatriation, in order to support their independence and to prevent them from falling victims again.

44. The Cabinet Office is conducting various awareness raising activities on human trafficking and has produced human trafficking awareness posters and leaflets, and provided them to local governments, airports, seaports, the Japan Association of Travel Agents, the IOM, and other relevant organizations.

45. The MHLW runs women's consulting offices that work with relevant organizations to protect women survivors of human trafficking regardless of nationality and age. Through these offices, MHLW provides food, clothing and shelter, full security, and support in receiving legal assistance, while taking their religions, diets, and health into consideration.

46. The police operate a hotline to receive anonymous reports on human trafficking-related crimes so that they can provide early protection for victims of human trafficking. They also actively exchange information with the investigating authorities in countries from which victims of human trafficking are traded, and provide investigative assistance at the request of foreign countries through ICPO-INTERPOL. The police further prepare multi-language leaflets urging victims to report such crimes to the police or relevant authorities, and place them in locations where victims can easily find them. Additionally, the NPA holds a communication meeting once a year to exchange opinions and information with contact points dealing with the issue of human trafficking such as embassies in Tokyo, international organizations, and NGOs.

47. In response to inquiries from victims, the Japan Legal Support Center provides information on legal systems and consultation centers supporting victims in multiple languages regardless of nationality etc. For victims who are not financially capable the Center also provides assistance, including an advance payment of attorney's fees needed for litigation.

48. The Immigration Control and Refugee Recognition Act excludes victims of human trafficking from forced deportation due to unlicensed activities and prostitution. Additionally, appropriate protection has been established by providing in the Act that the victims of human trafficking residing illegally in Japan, for example by overstaying, are eligible for Special Permission to Stay in Japan according to the law, with the aim of stabilizing their legal position.

49. The human rights bodies of the MOJ launched a system to provide human trafficking victims with temporary accommodation as an emergency refuge.

(c) Other

50. Under the amended Penal Code, oral intercourse and anal intercourse are punishable by the offense of rape, which impose heavier statutory penalty than that of forcible indecency. Moreover the gender requirement for a victim of rape is eliminated, and male can also be a victim of rape. As a matter of course, a person who forcibly commits sexual intercourse with sexual minorities shall be punished by the offense of rape.

4. Support for minorities (recommendation 161), racial discrimination, migrants, and refugees (recommendations 34, 35, 36, 64, 65, 84, 92, 162–166)

51. In connection with prohibiting all forms of direct or indirect racial discrimination (recommendations 35 and 64), in areas of a highly public nature, discrimination is prohibited by the relevant laws and regulations. As stated in Chapter II, A, 2, Article 14, Paragraph 1 of the Constitution, irrational discrimination is prohibited.

52. The human rights bodies of the MOJ conduct various awareness-raising activities such as posting banner ads and distributing promotional brochures and leaflets to ensure that the rights of foreign nationals and the Ainu who are indigenous people in Japan are respected.

53. The GOJ is undertaking measures that strive for the promotion of Ainu culture, the diffusion and awareness-raising of Ainu traditional knowledge, and the improvement of the lives of the Ainu people. The GOJ is also pursuing a comprehensive Ainu policy by holding the "Council for Ainu Policy Promotion" chaired by the Chief Cabinet Secretary.

54. Based on the Act on the Promotion of the Elimination of Buraku Discrimination coming into force in December 2016, the GOJ plans to enhance the counseling system, provide education and raise awareness to facilitate the elimination of discrimination related to Dowa issues (Buraku discrimination).

55. The Act on the Promotion of Efforts to Eliminate Unfair Discriminatory Speech and Behavior against Persons Originating from Outside Japan coming into force in June 2016 declares that unfair discriminatory speech and behavior against persons originating from outside Japan should not be tolerated. The Act aims to specify the basic principles, clarify the national government's responsibilities and set out and promote basic measures relating to efforts to eliminate such discriminatory speech and behavior.

56. The GOJ recognizes that a racially discriminatory motive is proven to be a vicious motive accordingly in the criminal trials in Japan and that the court takes this into consideration in sentencing. The human rights bodies of the MOJ provide counseling on a wide range of human rights issues including racial discrimination and discrimination based on sexual orientation. When they become aware of a suspected human rights violation, the bodies investigate without delay and take appropriate measures depending on the case. In addition, the bodies conduct various awareness-raising activities.

57. The human rights bodies of the MOJ provide human rights counseling, investigation and resolution of human rights violation cases. With regard to human rights counseling for foreign nationals, in order to provide counseling in six languages including English and Chinese, the bodies have established the "Foreign Language Human Rights Hotline" available nationwide, and have expanded the number of "Human Rights Counseling Centers for Foreigners" with interpretation services to 50 across the country. Furthermore, the bodies conduct various awareness-raising activities such as holding lectures and workshops, and distributing promotional brochures and leaflets to spread the concept of respect for human rights.

58. The MHLW designates June each year as "Foreign Workers Awareness Month". During the month, MHLW launches intensive awareness-raising activities to impart knowledge about the issues regarding proper employment of foreign workers to businesses and the public.

59. Regarding education and health of immigrants (recommendation 165), Japan's public compulsory education schools are open to foreign children at no cost, thereby guaranteeing opportunities for these children to receive the same education that Japanese children receive. In addition, just as for Japanese children, foreign children can also enroll in nursery schools if the necessity is recognized, which means they have access to daycare. Foreign nationals who have relocated from overseas are covered by the national health insurance if they have a status of residence that allows them to stay in Japan for more than three months, if they have physical addresses, and if there are no conditions that would preclude them from receiving insurance (e.g., they are enrolled in other health insurance programs). Those who are working for companies and meet eligibility requirements are covered by social insurance. Foreign nationals not enrolled in any health insurance program are entitled to health checkups in accordance with the Health Promotion Act. This means

that they have access to medical examinations to maintain their health, regardless of their legal status.

5. Other

Protection measures against human rights violations on the Internet (recommendation 149)

60. When the human rights bodies of the MOJ are asked for counseling on information on the Internet that may violate the consulter's rights, the bodies advise the consulter on how to request the deletion of the information. The bodies also take appropriate measures such as requesting an Internet service provider to delete information when the information is recognized as defamation or an invasion of privacy and thus as a human rights violation through an investigation. On the other hand, the MIC defines requirements for exemption from providers' liability in such a law as the Act on the Limitation of Liability for Damages of Specified Telecommunications Service Providers and the Right to Demand Disclosure of Identification Information of the Senders (the Provider Liability Limitation Law). MIC also participates as an observer in the process of creating and updating guidelines and models of terms of service for users by the private sector. These efforts are to facilitate proper voluntary removal of illegal and/or harmful information by Internet service providers.

Freedom of religion (recommendation 150)

61. Articles 19, 20 and 21, Paragraph 1 of the Constitution of Japan stipulate freedom of thought and conscience, freedom of religion, and freedom of expression, respectively. Furthermore, Article 14 of the Constitution prohibits discrimination based on thought and creeds, thereby guaranteeing freedom of religion. Article 20, Paragraph 2 of the Constitution also stipulates, "No person shall be compelled to take part in any religious act, celebration, rite or practice," and Paragraphs 1 and 3 of the same Article specify the non-religious nature of the State and prohibit religious activities by the State and its organs.

62. Statements concerning recommendations 132 and 155 (the Special Rapporteur), 172 (ODA), 173 (disaster reduction), and 174 (international cooperation) are included in Chapter III.

B. Measures partially implemented

Comprehensive legal measures pertaining to children's rights (recommendation 39)

63. The GOJ ensures that any conventions and treaties, when it concludes, will be consistent with the domestic law systems. While the Convention on the Rights of the Child stipulates a wide range of rights and other matters, many of these rights and matters are specified in international conventions on human rights that Japan has already concluded, and they are also guaranteed by the Constitution of Japan and other existing national legislation. Hence, the GOJ believes that the country already has adequate legislation necessary to implement the Convention. Furthermore, to help children fully develop well-balanced personalities so that they will lead their lives as well-rounded individuals in the world, it is vital to actually provide enhanced child protection and welfare in addition to introducing legislation for that purpose. The GOJ will continue to take measures to effectively achieve these goals and make further efforts toward improvement.

Expressly prohibit corporal punishment in all settings (recommendation 126)

64. While the meaning of "corporal punishment" is not absolutely clear, the acts of assault (Penal Code Article 208) or injury (Penal Code Article 204) can be punished.

Awarding grant-type scholarships (recommendation 157)

65. To award grant-type scholarships to university students and provide tuition waiver/reduction opportunities, the following were included as the FY2017 budget was compiled: foundation of a grant-type scholarship scheme; increase in lenders of interest-free scholarship loans; elimination of virtually all academic requirements for interest-free scholarship loans available to students from low-income households; and introduction of the new Scholarship Loans with Income-based Repayments System. Although the grant-type scholarship scheme will begin to operate fully in FY2018, it will come partially into operation during FY2017. In addition, the GOJ will continue to improve its support for universities in their tuition waiver and reduction programs.

Revising Civil Code to raise the marriage age for women (recommendations 42, 43, 74)

66. In February 1996, the Legislative Council of the MOJ, which serves as the advisory committee to the Minister of Justice, submitted a report on the revision of the Civil Code that includes introducing the option for spouses to not change their surnames. The Fourth Basic Plan for Gender Equality, which was endorsed by the Cabinet in December 2015, also states that the dual-surname system for each spouse to choose their legal name should be considered, taking judicial rulings into account. Currently, the contents of the aforementioned report are available on the website to encourage the public to have in-depth discussions. Regarding the law that barred women from remarrying within six months of a divorce, a revision to the Civil Code was brought into force in June 2016 to reduce the six-month period to 100 days and to specify the cases in which women can marry before the period is up.

67. Regarding the marriage age for women, the Legislative Council submitted a report in October 2009 stating that the marriage age for both men and women should be 18 years old should the legal age of adulthood be lowered to 18. The GOJ is considering making legislative changes that encompass lowering the legal age of adulthood under the Civil Code.

Direct prohibition of racist and xenophobic statements and ensuring access to means of defense (recommendation 37)

68. The Act on the Promotion of Efforts to Eliminate Unfair Discriminatory Speech and Behavior against Persons Originating from Outside Japan coming into force in June 2016 declares that unfair discriminatory speech and behavior against persons originating from outside Japan should not be tolerated. The Act aims to specify the basic principles, clarify the national government's responsibilities and set out and promote basic measures relating to efforts to eliminate such discriminatory speech and behavior.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) (recommendation 45)

69. In 2007, Japan enacted the "Act on Cooperation with the International Criminal Court," with which Japan can fully implement the obligations under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

70. The statement concerning recommendation 169 (follow-ups in Japan) is included in Chapter I, and those concerning recommendations 170 (contributions) and 171 (ODA) in Chapter III.

C. Other measures

1. Rights of specific types of people and groups

Refining the structure of domestic legislation and other measures in the field of human rights (recommendation 31)

71. Japan has conducted an appropriate review of the framework for a human rights remedy system incorporating the discussions made thus far.

Establishing a national human rights institution and human rights commission (recommendations 47–51, 53–59)

72. The GOJ submitted the Human Rights Commission Bill for the establishment of a human rights institution to the 181st National Diet Session in November 2012. The Bill was scrapped, however, due to the dissolution of the House of Representatives in the same month. Japan has conducted an appropriate review of the framework for a human rights remedy system incorporating the discussions made thus far.

73. Meanwhile, the Human Rights Bureau has been established in the MOJ as an administrative body engaging in the protection of human rights and as its subordinate organs, the Human Rights Department of the Legal Affairs Bureau (8 locations nationwide), the Human Rights Division of the District Legal Affairs Bureau (42 locations nationwide), and their branches (261, as of April 2017) have been established heretofore.

74. Moreover, the MOJ engages in human rights protection activities such as awareness-raising, counseling and remedy activities in corporation with about 14,000 Human Rights Volunteers who are private citizens appointed by the Minister of Justice.

75. The human rights bodies of the MOJ provide a wide range of human rights counseling at the 311 offices (as of April, 2017) of the Legal Affairs Bureau, the District Legal Affairs Bureau and their branches across the country, and the number of counseling cases was 225,073 in 2016. The bodies also engage in human rights remedy activities from a fair and neutral standpoint, and dealt with 19,443 cases in 2016.

Medical expenses that persons with disabilities need to cover (recommendation 156)

76. The GOJ will continue to identify their needs and provide follow-ups.

Implementing recommendations related to minority women given by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) (recommendation 160)

77. In the Fourth Basic Plan for Gender Equality, the GOJ acknowledges the importance of "actions taken for women facing multiple difficulties due to their gender." The Basic Plan states, "the government obtains information wherever possible about cases in which women face multiple difficulties due to their gender, promotes education and awareness-raising activities on human rights, and proceeds with efforts to investigate suspected cases of human rights violations and help victims."

Adopting a national action plan for children (recommendation 61)

78. The GOJ compiled various measures taken to ensure all children's rights stipulated in the Convention on the Rights of the Child into a national report and submitted it.

Integration of LGBT individuals and elimination of discriminatory treatment on the grounds of sexual orientation (recommendation 99)

79. In Japan, the "Act on Special Cases in Handling Gender Status for Persons with Gender Identity Disorders" came into effect in July 2004, and a revision made in 2008 relaxed the conditions necessary to change gender on the family register. The human rights bodies of the MOJ have established permanent and ad-hoc human rights counseling centers that provide counselling on a wide range of human rights issues including discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity. The bodies also conduct various awareness-raising activities to ensure that the rights of sexual minorities are respected. In the international context, on the basis of Japan's belief that human rights violations based on sexual orientation and gender identity should not be tolerated, Japan continues to present its views on this agenda and explain the social circumstances in Japan at various intergovernmental fora.

Entry requirements for foreign nationals (recommendation 167)

80. Entry requirements for foreign nationals are a matter of national sovereignty. The GOJ continues to explore necessary measures, while giving adequate consideration to their impact on the vibrancy of Japan's economy and society and on the safety and comfort of the daily lives of nationals, among other matters.

Amending the Immigration Control Act in relation to deportation (recommendation 48)

81. The GOJ takes the stance as recorded in the report of the Working Group on the UPR of Japan (A/HRC/22/14) (Paragraph 143). The Immigration Control Act stipulates that the Government must immediately deport foreign nationals to whom the written deportation order has been issued. Therefore, the GOJ is striving to deport these foreign nationals as soon as possible in accordance with the Act and is working on reducing long-term detention.

"The right to development" (recommendation 168)

82. The GOJ regards "the right to development" as human rights of individuals. Japan will continue to engage in discussions about this right to ensure that they are based on consensus.

2. Individual communications procedures (recommendations 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 15)

83. The First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the Optional Protocol to the CEDAW and others stipulate the individual communications procedure. The GOJ considers the procedure to be noteworthy in a sense that it could effectively guarantee the implementation of Human Rights Treaties. At the same time, consideration has been given to questions such as whether there are any problems in relation to Japan's judicial system and legislative policy, and the kind of system that would need to be established for implementation of the individual communications procedure in the case where Japan accepts it based on further discussion among the relevant ministries. In April 2010, the GOJ launched the Division for Implementation of Human Rights Treaties in the MOFA. In August 2016, the relevant ministries and agencies had their 19th workshop to discuss the individual communications procedure. The GOJ will continue to engage in the discussion on this matter, while taking various opinions into account.

3. Conclusion of conventions and optional protocols

The Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (OP-CAT) (recommendations 8, 9, 10)

84. The GOJ is considering the practical aspects of what "inspection" and other elements should consist of, and how the terms of Optional Protocol would relate to domestic laws and others, and therefore will continue considering this protocol.

The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (ICRMW) (recommendations 19, 20, 21, 22, 23)

85. The GOJ recognizes the need for serious and thorough consideration of the Convention from the perspective of the principle of equality and Japan's various domestic systems among others.

The ILO Convention 189 (recommendation 23)

86. Unlike other countries, the number of housekeepers (domestic workers) in Japan is small and has been on the decrease, and entry into Japan to work as housekeepers (domestic workers) is not permitted. Furthermore, some of the housekeepers (domestic workers) in Japan are not covered by the Labor Standards Act. In regard to the ratification of the ILO Convention No.189, it is necessary to make a careful consideration in light of the actual situation in Japan.

4. Reservations to conventions and others (recommendations 1 and 3)

87. With regard to the reservation of Article 7 (d) of ICESCR, taking into account the lack of societal consensus for the payment of wages on public holidays, the GOJ considers it appropriate to leave the matter of payment of remuneration on public holidays to an agreement between labor and management.

88. ICESCR Article 8 provides the right to organized labor strikes under the provision of 1 (d). Taking into account that no agreement would be possible between the laws and ordinances of Japan and the provision of Article 8 paragraph 2 that no hindrance shall be placed upon the lawful limitation of the sphere of "civil servants", which would be affected by the limitation, Japan reserves the right not to be restricted by the provision of 1(d). However, some sectors would still have the right to strike if they were already given the right under Japanese law at the time of the ratification of the convention.

89. Concerning the reservation regarding the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination Article 4(a)(b), the GOJ does not believe that, in Japan today, racist thoughts are disseminated and racial discrimination is incited to the extent that the withdrawal of its reservations and legislation to impose punishment against dissemination of racist thoughts and other acts should be considered even at the risk of unduly stifling legitimate speech.

90. Concerning the reservation regarding the Convention on the Rights of the Child Article 37 (c), under the Juvenile Act of Japan, persons under 20 years of age are treated as "juveniles", and this applies to persons deprived of liberty as well. Persons who are under 20 years of age (so called "juveniles") are, in principle, separated from persons who are 20 years of age or over (adults). This measure can be regarded as one step further advanced than the provision of this Convention under which a person under 18 years of age is to receive careful protection as a "child", since the Japanese system includes persons even up until under 20 years of age among those who are subject to protection. This conforms to the aim and objective of the provisions of Article 37 (c), namely, to protect young people from harmful influence by separating them from older persons.

III. Status of implementation of voluntary pledges

A. Cooperation for the United Nations

91. The GOJ has actively contributed to activities by the Human Rights Council and the Third Committee of the United Nations (UN) General Assembly through various opportunities, including the UPR, to improve human rights situations of various countries and regions and to find solutions related to human rights issues. Since the establishment of the UN Human Rights Council in 2006, Japan served as a Council member from 2006 to 2011 and from 2013 to 2015, helping shape opinions in the international community by making active contributions to the Council's discussions and the adoption of its key resolutions. It also has taken the lead in the adoption of the Resolution on the Elimination of Discrimination against Persons Affected by Leprosy and their Family Members and the follow-up resolution. Japan serves again as a Council member for three years from January 2017, and intends to continue making active contributions to the Human Rights Council.

Special procedures (recommendations 132 and 155)

92. The GOJ values the principles of dialogue and cooperation in the process of human rights diplomacy, and thus it attaches importance to the roles of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) and the special procedures. Since the UPR in 2012, Japan has received visits by the Special Rapporteurs on the right to health, on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography, on the freedom of opinion and expression, and on the situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Japan will continue to offer its full cooperation to OHCHR and the special procedures, to ensure meaningful and constructive dialogues.

93. To prepare for a visit to Japan by the Special Rapporteur on the right to health (recommendation 155), the GOJ facilitated his visit. During his stay, he had meetings with Japanese government officials, survivors and evacuees of the Great East Japan Earthquake, and citizens' groups. The GOJ also provides financial and technical assistance to Fukushima Prefecture. For example, it contributed a grant of ¥78.2 billion to the Fukushima Residents Health Management Fund set up by Fukushima Prefecture to help Fukushima residents manage their mid- and long-term health.

Examination by the treaty bodies

94. The GOJ has been committed to the sincere implementation of the human rights treaties it has concluded, including the submission of government reports and related examinations. After the UPR in 2012, the GOJ submitted its government reports on five conventions (i.e., CEDAW, CRC, ICERD, ICPPED, and CRPD), and was reviewed on five conventions (i.e., ICESCR, ICCPR, CEDAW, ICERD, and CAT). Japan will continue to duly follow up on the recommendations it has received from these human rights treaty bodies in order to strengthen its cooperation with the human rights treaty bodies and its commitments pertaining to the implementation of these human rights treaties.

B. Contribution to the international community

Bilateral dialogues (recommendation 174)

95. The GOJ, recognizing the importance of dialogue and cooperation based on the principle of mutual understanding and respect, has held regular bilateral dialogues and consultations on human rights with the governments of more than 10 countries and the regional economic integration organization, including Myanmar, Cambodia, Iran, and the

EU. The GOJ will continue to hold these dialogues on human rights with various countries, and contribute to each country's efforts to solve human rights issues by sharing best practices and other means.

Development cooperation (recommendations 170, 171, 172, 173, 174)

96. The GOJ established the Development Cooperation Charter in February 2015. The Charter states that Japan assists in building the foundations and driving force of economic growth, such as industrial infrastructure, industrial development, human resource development, and employment creation, as well as in efforts to help people maintain their basic human needs, giving adequate consideration to the importance of human and social development. With regard to human rights, the Charter mentions "the consolidation of democratization, the rule of law and the protection of basic human rights" as the principles for ensuring the appropriateness of development cooperation. It also emphasizes that Japan will make efforts needed to reinforce the foundation for providing development cooperation, while being mindful of the internationally-agreed target of increasing ODA to 0.7 percent of gross national income (GNI).

97. Japan pledged and implemented $978.02 million of ODA for healthcare in 2014, and $3 billion for women's empowerment (including the area of health, education and agriculture) over the three years starting from 2013. It has also pledged and is steadily implementing more than ¥42 billion of ODA to improve access for women and girls to quality education over the three years starting from 2015. In 2016, the GOJ launched the Development Strategy for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment as one of its thematic policies based on the Development Cooperation Charter. At the Third World Assembly for Women (WAW!) held in December of the same year, the GOJ announced its plan to implement over US$3 billion in total assistance for women in developing countries over the three years until 2018, and has been steadily implementing this commitment.

98. In the area of disaster risk reduction, Japan hosted the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in March 2015, and took the lead in the adoption of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. The GOJ launched the Sendai Cooperation Initiative for Disaster Risk Reduction and announced aid of $4 billion and development of 40,000 people of human resources over the next four years. Furthermore, Japan also took the lead in the adoption of the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly that designated the World Tsunami Awareness Day. As a follow-up, the GOJ organized the High School Students Summit on "World Tsunami Awareness Day" in Kuroshio in 2016, and launched efforts that include disaster risk reduction drills across the world.

99. As part of its assistance for governance, Japan actively contributes to assistance for legal and judicial systems, police, and democratization (e.g., providing electoral assistance, capacity building of parliaments and the media).

100. Japan actively collaborates with and contributes to the activities of relevant international organizations working to protect and promote human rights (e.g., OHCHR, UNHCR, UNDP, UNICEF, UN Women). Japan will continue to support these organizations, while trying to reflect its policies in the use of budgets, including through voluntary contributions.

C. Hosting WAW! (World Assembly for Women)

101. As part of its efforts toward "a society where women shine," the GOJ hosted the World Assembly for Women (WAW!) three times (2014, 2015, 2016) to facilitate discussion toward women's empowerment and gender equality.

102. The GOJ hosted the Third World Assembly for Women (WAW!) in Tokyo on December 13 and 14, 2016. Ninety-three leaders in the field of women's empowerment participated in the discussion in the presence of 800 participants. With "WAW! for Action" as the main topic, the discussion proceeded around moves toward women's empowerment and gender equality in Japan and overseas, such as the full enforcement of the Act on Promotion of Women's Participation and Advancement in the Workplace and the adoption of the SDGs. A public forum was held on the 13th and five roundtable discussions were held on the 14th. The roundtables dealt with developing the capacity of women and promoting their active role in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM), promoting women's leadership, work-life management, women's health, and participation and empowerment of women in peace and security. Special sessions were also held on the same day to discuss women's participation and advancement in local communities and how to achieve a gender equal society among younger generations. Ideas and suggestions from participants were compiled into a document titled "WAW! To Do 2016" and published as a UN document (A/71/829).

103. The approximately four-month period before and after WAW! (October 1, 2016–January 31, 2017) was designated as "Shine Weeks", during which official side events were held both inside and outside Japan.

IV. Progress and challenges in addressing new and emerging issues (Efforts to achieve the SDGs)

104. Japan chaired the G7 Ise-Shima Summit, which was the first summit held after the SDGs were set. At the summit, the G7 members confirmed their commitment to their efforts to achieve the SDGs as their priority in development cooperation. To take leadership as the chair of the G7 summit, the GOJ set up the SDGs Promotion Headquarters headed by the Prime Minister and consisting of all cabinet ministers in May 2016. At the Headquarters' first meeting it was decided to develop guiding principles that Japan would follow while working toward the SDGs. A pledge was also made to provide about $1.1 billion for international health organizations as a new contribution to help achieve the SDGs for global health.

105. Given the decision to develop guiding principles, the SDGs Promotion Headquarters hosted the SDGs Promotion Roundtable Meeting attended by a wide range of experts and stakeholders such as NGOs, the private sector, and international organizations. The meeting was held in September and November 2016. The Headquarters also organized public comments to exchange views and opinions with a broad range of stakeholders. As a result, at the time of the Headquarters' second meeting held in December of the same year, the SDGs Implementation Guiding Principles were finalized and compiled into a document that consists of the written Principles and the Annex.

106. The Implementation Guiding Principles state the vision, "Become a leader toward a future where economic, social and environmental improvements are attained in an integrated, sustainable and resilient manner while leaving no one behind." The document also specifies the five principles for implementation and what follow-ups entail. The Principles also adjust the goals of the SDGs to contexts in Japan to show the pillars of efforts on which Japan should particularly focus, and list eight priority areas such as "Empowerment of All People" and "Achievement of Good Health and Longevity." The Annex includes 140 measures in Japan and overseas suggested by relevant ministries and agencies as specific actions urged for these eight priority areas.

107. Specific initiatives to achieve the SDGs in relation to the finalized Implementation Guiding Principles were announced at the Headquarters' second meeting. The initiative for

global health is to provide a total of about $400 million for international health organizations to fight infectious diseases including polio, to strengthen health systems, and to support actions for women's health. Furthermore, to support refugees and countries accepting refugees, a new pledge to actively draw on Japan's experience and capacity for more qualitative and quantitative improvements on the initiatives in this field was announced together with its plan to provide about $500 million in aid as a new contribution. As for women's empowerment in developing countries, a total of about US $3 billion by 2018 for the focus areas, namely the promotion of women's rights, improving an enabling environment for women and girls to reach their full potentials, and advancement of women's leadership were announced.

108. The GOJ will cooperate closely with relevant ministries and agencies to work with stakeholders in all areas in accordance with the SDGs Implementation Principles, thereby playing a leading role in efforts by the international community to achieve the SDGs.

United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/28/JPN/2

General Assembly

Distr.: General
4 September 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-eighth session
6-17 November 2017

Compilation on Japan

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a compilation of the information contained in reports of treaty bodies and special procedures and other relevant United Nations documents, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[1, 2]

2. In 2016, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women called upon Japan to consider ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women[3] and the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.[4] The same Committee[5] and the Special Rapporteur on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography[6] recommended that Japan ratify the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure.

3. In 2014, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination encouraged Japan to make the declaration under article 14 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, recognizing its competence to receive and consider individual complaints.[7]

4. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights encouraged Japan to consider signing and ratifying the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.[8]

5. In 2014, the Human Rights Committee invited Japan to consider acceding to the Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.[9]

6. In 2013, the Committee against Torture and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) encouraged Japan to consider acceding to the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the 1961 Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness[10] and to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.[11]

7. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) encouraged Japan to ratify the 1960 UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education and to submit national reports on its implementation.[12]

8. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women[13] and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights[14] urged Japan to consider ratifying the International Labour Organization (ILO) Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), the Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189) and the Abolition of Forced Labour Convention, 1957 (No. 105).

9. Japan contributed financially to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in 2012, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017.[15]

10. In 2017, Japan submitted its midterm report regarding the implementation of the recommendations made during the second cycle of the universal periodic review in 2012.[16]

III. National human rights framework[17]

11. Several treaty bodies reiterated their concern that Japan had not established an independent national human rights institution, in accordance with the principles relating to the status of national institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (the Paris Principles).[18] The Special Rapporteur on sale of children recommended that Japan adopt a bill on human rights protection that, inter alia, established a national human rights institution and an independent children's rights advocate.[19]

IV. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

A. Cross-cutting issues

1. Equality and non-discrimination[20]

12. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination noted the absence of an adequate definition of racial discrimination on the grounds of national or ethnic origin, colour and descent in legislation,[21] and reports of the spread of hate speech, including incitement to imminent violence, in the media, on the Internet and in statements made by public officials and politicians. Such acts were not always properly investigated and prosecuted.[22] The Human Rights Committee and the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression expressed similar concerns and urged Japan to adopt a broadly applicable anti-discrimination law.[23] The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women called upon Japan to adopt a comprehensive definition of discrimination against women in legislation, in line with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women,[24] and realize substantive gender equality, in accordance with the Convention, throughout the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.[25]

13. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that stereotyping continued to be the root cause of sexual violence against women and that pornography, video games and animation products, such as manga, promoted sexual violence.[26] It urged Japan to review educational textbooks and materials to eliminate discriminatory gender stereotypes, adopt legislation and sanction sexist speech and propaganda advocating racial superiority or hatred.[27]

14. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that non-citizens were excluded from accessing some public places and facilities on the basis of race or nationality. It recommended that Japan take appropriate measures by effectively applying legislation and investigating and sanctioning such acts.[28]

15. The Human Rights Committee was concerned about reports of harassment and stigmatization of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender persons and discriminatory provisions that excluded same-sex couples from the municipal housing system.[29] The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women urged Japan to pursue efforts to eliminate multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination against women with disabilities, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex women and migrant women, which affected their access to health, education, employment and participation in public life.[30]

16. The same Committee recommended that Japan abolish all discriminatory provisions regarding the status of children born out of wedlock and provide legal protection for them and their mothers from stigma and discrimination.[31]

2. Development, the environment, and business and human rights[32]

17. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned that the specific needs of disadvantaged and vulnerable groups had not been sufficiently met during the evacuation, rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts following the Great East Japan Earthquake and Fukushima nuclear accident. It recommended the adoption of a human rights-based approach to disaster response, risk mitigation and reconstruction efforts.[33] The Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health expressed similar concerns.[34]

18. The Special Rapporteur on health recommended that Japan release disaster-related information to the public as soon as an accident occurred and ensure effective and inclusive community participation in decision-making processes relating to nuclear energy policy and the nuclear regulatory framework.[35]

19. The Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, encouraged Japan to integrate a human rights-based approach into the formulation, implementation and monitoring of its development cooperation programme so as to further enhance its policy thereon.[36] He was concerned that export credit agencies exacerbated the debt problems of poor countries, had negative impacts on human rights and the environment and lacked transparency. He encouraged Japanese investments abroad to be consistent with relevant international human rights and labour standards.[37] The Independent Expert recommended that Japan enhance its financial support to civil society organizations involved in the promotion and protection of human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights, in the countries receiving development assistance from Japan.[38]

20. The Special Rapporteur on sale of children commended the business sector for combating online child sexual exploitation, but was concerned at the insufficient involvement of media and advertising companies in prevention efforts.[39] She recommended that Japan take comprehensive preventive measures in partnership with the business sector and non-governmental organizations, and with the involvement of children and youth.[40]

21. The Independent Expert on foreign debt welcomed the fact that, in the context of the post-2015 development framework, Japan aimed to promote universal access to basic health-care services and universal health coverage to satisfy broader health and medical needs.[41]

B. Civil and political rights

1. Right to life, liberty and security of person[42]

22. The Human Rights Committee remained concerned that capital punishment had not been limited to the "most serious crimes", and that death row inmates were kept in solitary confinement for up to 40 years before execution and without notice prior to the day of execution. The Committee recommended that Japan consider abolishing the death penalty, ensure that the death row regime did not amount to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and refrain from imposing solitary confinement, except in the most exceptional circumstances and for strictly limited periods.[43] The Committee against Torture was concerned at the non-use of the power of pardon since 2007 and the absence of transparency concerning procedures for seeking benefit for pardon, commutation or reprieve.[44]

23. The Committee against Torture was concerned that torture was not defined in legislation[45] and about ill-treatment during interrogations in the *daiyo kangoku* (substitute prison system). It recommended that Japan take steps to ensure inadmissibility in court of confessions obtained under torture and ill-treatment, establish rules concerning the length of interrogations — with appropriate sanctions for non-compliance — and improve criminal investigation methods.[46]

24. The Committee was also concerned at detention conditions, including overcrowding,[47] detention in police cells for periods of up to 23 days — with limited access to a lawyer and without the possibility of bail[48] — and the frequent use of solitary confinement.[49] The Human Rights Committee recommended that Japan ensure that the detention system was fully compliant with international standards by guaranteeing alternatives to detention, such as bail, the right to counsel and the presence of defence counsel during interrogations.[50]

25. The Committee against Torture was further concerned at the frequent use of solitary confinement, restraints and forced medication in mental health institutions, which may amount to inhumane and degrading treatment.[51]

2. Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[52]

26. The Human Rights Committee regretted the continued use of the *daiyo kangoku* for criminal investigations and recommended taking measures to abolish the substitute detention system or ensure its compliance with international standards.[53] The Committee against Torture was concerned at the lack of effective judicial control over pretrial detention in police cells and of an independent and effective inspection and complaints mechanism.[54] It recommended that Japan take legislative and other measures to ensure separation of the functions of investigation and detention,[55] consider establishing a dedicated, independent and effective complaints body, ensure prompt, impartial and full investigations into all allegations of torture and ill-treatment, and prosecute and punish those responsible.[56]

27. The Human Rights Committee recommended that legal safeguards against wrongful sentencing to death be strengthened by, inter alia, guaranteeing the defence full access to all prosecution materials and ensuring that confessions obtained by torture or ill-treatment were not invoked as evidence.[57]

28. The Committee recommended that Japan take concrete action to prosecute rape and other sexual violence crimes ex officio.[58]

3. Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[59]

29. The Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression was concerned about the Protection of Specially Designated Secrets Act and urged Japan to continue work and to be vigilant so as to avoid the possibility of designating information as secret even if its disclosure would not jeopardize national security and to amend the law to ensure that there would not be any chilling effect on the work of journalists.[60]

30. UNESCO noted that the Protection of Specially Designated Secrets Act had entered into force in December 2014. Whistle-blowers who leaked "State secrets" could face up to 10 years in prison, while journalists who published leaked information could face up to 5 years in prison. It recommended that Japan consider amending the Act to include an exception to guarantee that no individual would be punished for disclosing information of public interest that did not harm national security and establish an independent oversight board and a broadcast regulatory authority for the Act.[61] The Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression was concerned that a weak system of legal protection, persistent exploitation of the media by the Government and the recent adoption of the Act had imposed significant challenges, especially for the mainstream media. He was also concerned about unnecessary restrictions on protest activities, particularly in Okinawa, and allegations of surveillance of the Muslim community.[62] The Human Rights Committee was concerned about reports of widespread surveillance of Muslims by law enforcement officials.[63]

31. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted the low representation of women in all sectors and the underrepresentation of minority women, such as Ainu, Buraku and *Zainichi* women and women with disabilities, in decision-making positions.[64] It recommended temporary special measures, including quotas, to accelerate the achievement of substantive equality of women and men, in particular to enhance the rights of all women in decision-making positions in the public and private sectors, especially in Parliament,[65] while integrating a gender perspective into all sustainable development policies.[66] The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination made a similar recommendation to enhance consultations with Ryuku representatives.[67]

4. Prohibition of all forms of slavery[68]

32. The Committee against Torture noted the steps taken to acknowledge the abuses against the so-called "comfort women", victims of sexual slavery practices during the Second World War. However, it remained deeply concerned at the rejection of several recommendations made during the previous universal periodic review and by other United Nations human rights mechanisms and Human Rights Council special procedures.[69] It urged Japan to take immediate and effective legislative and administrative measures to find a victim-centred resolution for those women, in particular, by publicly acknowledging legal responsibility for sexual slavery crimes, prosecuting and punishing perpetrators, and providing victims with full and effective redress and reparation.[70] The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted efforts to resolve the issue through the bilateral agreement signed by Japan and the Republic of Korea on 28 December 2015. However, the Committee regretted the position of Japan that the matter did not fall within its mandate as the alleged violations had occurred prior to the entry into force of the Convention for Japan, in 1985.[71] It observed the continuing effect of the issue on the rights of victims/survivors, given the continued lack of effective remedies.[72] The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination urged Japan to take action to conclude investigations into violations of the rights of the comfort women and to bring to justice those responsible.[73] The ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations expressed the firm hope that the Government would make every effort to achieve reconciliation with the victims.[74] The Human Rights Committee was concerned about attacks on the reputation of former comfort women, including by public officials, some of which had been encouraged by the equivocal position of Japan.[75] The Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression was concerned that the Government had undermined public debates on the issue of comfort women. He noted that references to "comfort women" had been edited out of junior high school textbooks, which undermined the public's right to know about and understand its past.[76]

33. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted the adoption of an action plan and the establishment of the Council for the Promotion of Measures to Combat Trafficking in Persons but it was concerned that Japan remained a source, transit and destination country for trafficking in persons for labour and sexual exploitation.[77] The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended that Japan provide redress to victims of trafficking and investigate, prosecute and punish those responsible.[78] It was concerned about the persistence of trafficking in minority

women, in particular for sexual exploitation, and the absence of information on administration of justice to victims.[79]

34. The Human Rights Committee and the ILO Committee of Experts were concerned about the persistence of trafficking, the low number of prison sentences imposed on perpetrators and that no perpetrator of forced labour had been brought to justice.[80]

35. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that women and girls entering Japan under the Industrial Training and Technical Internship Programme were victims of forced labour and sexual exploitation. It recommended that Japan intensify regular labour inspections, and monitoring and inspection programmes.[81] The ILO Committee of Experts shared the concerns of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and requested that the current programme be replaced with a new scheme focused on capacity-building.[82] The Human Rights Committee was concerned about the large number of reports of sexual abuse of foreign trainees and interns, labour-related deaths and conditions that could amount to forced labour, despite legislative amendments.[83] The Special Rapporteur on sale of children expressed similar concerns regarding children.[84] The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned about the long working hours for technical interns and the non-payment of proper wages, and recommended that the programme be reformed to protect their working rights.[85]

5. Right to privacy and family life[86]

36. The Special Rapporteur on the right to privacy expressed concern that the proposed bill revising parts of the Punishment of Organized Crimes Act, known as the "anti-conspiracy" bill, which was aimed at combating terrorism. Owing to its broad scope, the bill could, if adopted, lead to undue restrictions on the rights to privacy and freedom of expression.[87]

37. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that the Civil Code still prohibited women from remarrying within a specified period after divorce, although the Supreme Court had ruled to shorten the period from 6 months to 100 days. The same Committee and the Human Rights Committee urged Japan to abolish the waiting period for women to remarry upon divorce.[88]

38. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that discriminatory provisions in the Civil Code had set the minimum age for marriage at 16 years for women and 18 years for men, and urged Japan to raise the legal minimum age for women to 18 years.[89]

39. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination considered the systematic collection of security information about individuals based solely on their belonging to an ethnic or ethno-religious group to be a serious form of discrimination.[90]

C. Economic, social and cultural rights

1. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[91]

40. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women welcomed the adoption of the Promotion of Women's Participation and Advancement in the Workplace Act in 2015, but was concerned at the widening gender pay gap.[92] The Human Rights Committee was concerned about reports that women represented 70 per cent of the part-time workforce and earned on average 58 per cent of salaries paid to men for equivalent work.[93] The ILO Committee of Experts requested Japan to step up its efforts to encourage enterprises to take positive measures to narrow the gender pay gap, including regarding women's access to managerial positions and the reconciliation of work and family responsibilities for both men and women on an equal footing.[94] The Special Rapporteur on health was informed that a significant number of workers in the nuclear power industry, who had been employed through layers of subcontractors for short periods of time, did not benefit from proper and effective monitoring of their health.[95] He recommended that Japan

monitor the health effects of radiation on nuclear plant workers and provide treatment, where necessary.[96]

41. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights noted with concern that a significant number of workers continued to work for excessively long hours, and was concerned about work-related deaths and suicides, despite the measures to encourage employers to take voluntary action.[97] It recommended that Japan protect workers' right to safe and healthy working conditions, ensure the application of deterrent sanctions for non-compliance with limits on extending working hours and adopt legislation and regulations aimed at prohibiting and preventing all forms of harassment in the workplace.[98]

2. Right to social security[99]

42. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned that significant cuts to budget allocations for social assistance had negatively impacted the enjoyment of economic and social rights for disadvantaged and marginalized groups.[100]

43. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned at reports of poverty among women and urged Japan to intensify its efforts towards poverty reduction and sustainable development.[101] The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned about the incidence of poverty among older persons, especially those who did not receive pensions, and low-income pensioners.[102]

44. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that upon the removal of the nationality clause from the National Pension Law in 1982, combined with the age and residence requirements introduced by the 1986 amendment, a number of non-citizens, including Koreans who had lost their Japanese nationality in 1952, might have been left out and remained ineligible for pension benefits under the national pension scheme.[103]

3. Right to an adequate standard of living[104]

45. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights was concerned that the average level of minimum wage fell short of the minimum subsistence level. It urged Japan to review the relevant factors and ensure that the minimum wage enabled a decent living for workers and their families.[105]

4. Right to health[106]

46. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted the efforts to address radiation-related health concerns following the Fukushima nuclear accident in 2011. It was concerned that the plans to lift the designation of contaminated areas with radiation exposure levels under 20 millisieverts per year as evacuation zones threatened the health of women and girls.[107] The Human Rights Committee recommended that Japan take measures to protect the lives of people affected by the Fukushima nuclear disaster and lift the designation of contaminated areas as evacuation zones only where the radiation level did not place residents at risk.[108]

47. The Human Rights Committee and the Committee against Torture were concerned at the large number of persons with mental disabilities who had been subjected to prolonged involuntary hospitalization without access to an effective remedy.[109]

48. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned at the high ratio of abortion and suicide among teenage girls and women and that women could obtain an abortion only when it was deemed that the continuation of pregnancy or delivery might significantly damage their physical health or if they had been raped in a violent or threatening manner.[110] It recommended that Japan amend the Penal Code and the Maternal Protection Act to legalize abortion and remove the requirement of spousal consent.[111]

49. UNESCO recommended that Japan provide access to reproductive and sexual health education and information for adolescents and include it appropriately in curricula and textbooks.[112]

50. The Special Rapporteur on health encouraged Japan to explore other health effects of radiation on children,[113] and urged it to urgently develop a long-term decontamination policy aimed at reducing radiation to less than 1 millisieverts per year as soon as possible.[114] He noted that the mental and physical health of children had deteriorated owing to the lack of outdoor activities, safe play areas and restrictions on school activities. He called for quality mental health facilities and goods and services to be made available and accessible to the affected communities.[115] The Special Rapporteur was concerned that the official Fukushima curriculum for compulsory radiation education in public schools lacked evidence of high risk of disease when exposed for a short time to radiation levels of 100 millisieverts and below.[116] He recommended that Japan include in schoolbooks and materials accurate information about the risk of radiation exposure and the greater vulnerability of children to radiation exposure.[117]

5. Right to education[118]

51. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned about the wide gender gap in higher education enrolment and in traditionally male-dominated fields of study. It recommended that Japan promote equal access for women and girls to all levels of education.[119]

52. The same Committee was concerned at reports of low literacy levels among ethnic Ainu and Buraku and other minority communities, particularly among older women, and recommended the removal of all obstacles to their access to education.[120]

53. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights[121] and the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination[122] were concerned about the legislative provisions and government actions that hindered the right to education of children of Korean origin, including the exclusion of Korean schools from the high school tuition support programme, which constituted discrimination.

54. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended that Japan facilitate education in and the teaching of minority languages for children belonging to minority and indigenous peoples. It also recommended the revision of textbooks that did not reflect the history, culture and contributions of Japanese groups protected by the Convention.[123]

55. UNESCO noted the adoption of the Second Basic Plan for the Promotion of Education (2013-2017) concerning tuition fees.[124] It encouraged Japan to tackle more actively the issue of high university tuition fees by, inter alia, establishing financial assistance for disadvantaged students.[125]

D. Rights of specific persons or groups

1. Women[126]

56. The Human Rights Committee recommended that Japan thoroughly investigate all reports of domestic violence, including in same-sex couples, prosecute and punish perpetrators with appropriate sanctions, provide redress to victims and ensure that immigrant women who were victims of sexual violence did not lose their visa status.[127]

57. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women was concerned that the Ministry of Justice committee that had reviewed the Penal Code did not consider it necessary to explicitly criminalize marital rape. It urged Japan to expedite the amendment of the Penal Code to expand the definition of rape and ensure ex officio prosecution of sex crimes.[128]

58. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women regretted the persistent violence against foreign, minority and indigenous women and their reluctance to report domestic violence to the authorities for fear of having their residence status revoked.[129] The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended that adequate measures be taken to

effectively address such violence by prosecuting and sanctioning all forms of violence and ensuring that victims had access to immediate means of redress and protection.[130]

59. The same Committee also recommended that Japan review its legislation on residence status to ensure that foreign women married to Japanese citizens or non-citizens with permanent residence status would not be expelled upon divorce or repudiation and that the application of the law did not have the effect, in practice, of forcing women to remain in abusive relationships.[131]

2. Children[132]

60. The Special Rapporteur on sale of children noted the high suspension rate of sentences for offences involving the sexual exploitation of children. She recommended that Japan step up efforts to investigate and prosecute such acts, including prostitution and pornography, to ensure the accountability of perpetrators and redress for child victims, and effectively apply and implement sanctions in the Penal Code for offences relating to the sexual exploitation of children.[133]

61. The Committee against Torture shared the concerns of the Committee on the Rights of the Child that corporal punishment at home and in alternative care settings was not expressly prohibited by law and that the Civil Code and the Act on Child Abuse Prevention provided for appropriate discipline but were not clear as to the admissibility of corporal punishment. It recommended that corporal punishment be explicitly prohibited in all settings by law.[134] The Human Rights Committee observed that corporal punishment was not prohibited in schools and was concerned at its prevalence and social acceptance.[135]

62. The Special Rapporteur on the sale of children welcomed the 2014 legislative amendment that criminalized the simple possession of child pornography and the adoption of a new plan of action to combat trafficking in persons. However, while noting the adoption and renewal of numerous plans and policies, she was concerned at the lack of a comprehensive approach in combating sexual exploitation of children. She recommended that Japan strengthen and develop a comprehensive strategy against the sexual exploitation of children.[136] The Special Rapporteur was concerned about forced pornography, featuring primarily women and girl victims aged from 17 to 20, who had been manipulated and forced to have sex on camera, and that once the girls reached legal majority, they were forced, under deceit, duress or coercion, to sign a contract obliging them to participate in pornographic shootings or filming. The existence of a contract discouraged investigations and made prosecution difficult.[137] Japan had been singled out as a major producer of sexually exploitative representations of virtual children in subgenres of manga, anime, computer graphics and video, and online games that contained depictions of extreme child pornography.[138]

3. Persons with disabilities[139]

63. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women noted that, under the Eugenic Protection Act, the State sought to prevent births of children with diseases or disabilities and, as a result, persons with disabilities had been subjected to forced sterilization. The Committee noted that, out of approximately 16,500 cases of sterilization without consent, 70 per cent concerned women and that no efforts had been made to provide redress.[140]

64. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that, despite the removal in 1982 of the nationality clause from the Basic Disability Pension of the National Pension Law, non-citizens who had lost eligibility to receive benefits before 1 January 1982 — owing to the removal of the nationality clause — and other non-citizens with disabilities who were over the age of 20 as of that date, remained excluded from receiving the Basic Disability Pension.[141]

65. UNESCO noted that a new law prohibiting discrimination against persons with disabilities had entered into force in April 2016.[142] It encouraged Japan to ensure that the provisions of the new law were fully aligned with international standards on education and that it promoted inclusive education over the establishment or maintenance of a special education system.[143]

4. Minorities and indigenous peoples[144]

66. The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women called upon Japan to pursue efforts to eliminate multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination experienced by indigenous and ethnic minority women, such as Ainu, Buraku and Zainichi Korean women.[145]

67. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination noted the measures taken and implemented concerning the Ryukyu people based on the Act on Special Measures for the Promotion and Development of Okinawa and the Okinawa Promotion Plan. However, it was concerned that sufficient measures had not been taken to consult Ryukyu representatives regarding the protection of their rights.[146]

68. The same Committee was concerned about the low/insufficient number of Ainu representatives on the Ainu Promotion Policy Council and other consultative bodies; the persistent gaps between Ainu and the rest of the population in many areas of life; insufficient protection of Ainu rights to land and natural resources; and the slow progress made towards the realization of their right to their own culture and language. It recommended the adoption of appropriate measures to protect Ainu rights to land, culture and language and ensure implementation aimed at the realization of those rights.[147]

69. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination regretted that Japan did not recognize the Ryukyu people as indigenous peoples, despite recognition by UNESCO of their unique ethnicity, history, culture and traditions. It recommended that Japan enhance consultations with Ryukyu representatives on matters relating to the promotion and protection of Ryukyu rights.[148] The Human Rights Committee welcomed the recognition of Ainu as an indigenous group, but reiterated its concern regarding the lack of recognition of the Ryukyu people and their rights to their traditional land and resources, and their children's right to be educated in their language.[149]

70. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination also regretted the exclusion of the Burakumin from the application of the Convention on grounds of descent, and recommended that Japan revise its position and adopt a clear definition of Burakumin in consultation with them.[150]

5. Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[151]

71. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned about the reported unequal treatment of migrants in employment and access to housing.[152]

72. The Human Rights Committee was concerned about reported cases of ill-treatment during deportations, which had resulted in the death of one person in 2010. It was also concerned that, despite the amendment to the Immigration Control and Refugee Recognition Act, the principle of non-refoulement was not implemented effectively, in practice,[153] that there was no independent appeal mechanism with suspensive effect against negative asylum decisions, and that administrative detention was used for prolonged periods without adequate reasons and without an independent review of the detention decision.[154] The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Committee against Torture expressed similar concerns.[155]

73. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned about reports of unequal treatment and racial discrimination of refugees and asylum seekers, in particular non-Asians and Africans, the detention of asylum seekers for long periods and the inadequate conditions in detention facilities. It recommended that the concept of non-discrimination be promoted among local authorities and communities with regard to refugees and asylum seekers and that detention of asylum seekers be used only as a last resort and for the shortest possible period.[156] The Committee against Torture expressed similar concerns about indefinite detention for asylum seekers and the lack of an independent review of such decisions.[157]

74. UNHCR was concerned about the detention policies regarding asylum seekers under the age of 18. As of the end of March 2015, 376 asylum seekers had been in detention.[158] It was also concerned that eligibility screening took a long time, that there was no legal framework to provide adequate support for asylum seekers with vulnerabilities and that the

amount of assistance provided to asylum seekers was smaller than the social welfare benefits for low-income Japanese nationals and long-term foreign residents.[159] UNHCR recommended that Japan adopt a dedicated asylum law that included, inter alia, legal provisions introducing a clear set of criteria and procedural safeguards for the treatment of repeat applications and the granting of complementary forms of protection; establish legal and policy frameworks to avoid the detention of asylum seekers; continue efforts to end the detention of children; and establish a mandatory and independent review of detention with appropriate judicial safeguards.[160]

6. Stateless persons[161]

75. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was concerned that some stateless persons without residence permits faced indefinite pre-deportation detention and some were at risk of human rights abuses. It recommended that Japan develop a procedure to determine statelessness so as to ensure adequate identification and protection of stateless persons.[162]

76. UNHCR noted that statelessness was not an established criterion for either regularizing the legal stay of or granting work permits to persons in an irregular situation[163] and that the definition of statelessness did not exist in national laws.[164] UNHCR recommended that Japan develop a procedure to determine statelessness so as to ensure the identification and protection of stateless persons.

Notes

1 Tables containing information on the scope of international obligations and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies for Japan will be available at www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/JPIndex.aspx.
2 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.1-147.13, 147.15-147.30, 147.106 and 147.112.
3 See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 8-9.
4 Ibid., para. 54. See also CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 27.
5 See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, para. 27.
6 See A/HRC/31/58/Add.1, para. 74.
7 See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 31.
8 See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 35.
9 See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 13.
10 See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 9, and UNHCR submission to the universal periodic review of Japan, p. 5.
11 See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 26.
12 UNESCO submission to the universal periodic review of Japan, p. 5.
13 See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, para. 35.
14 See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, paras. 14-15.
15 See OHCHR, "Funding" in *OHCHR Report 2012*, p. 117, *OHCHR Report 2014*, p. 63, *OHCHR Report 2015*, p. 61, *OHCHR Report 2016*, p. 79 and *OHCHR Report 2017* (forthcoming).
16 See www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/UPRImplementation.aspx.
17 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.47-147.59.
18 See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 14-15, CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 9, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 7, E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 8, and CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 16.
19 See A/HRC/31/58/Add.1, para. 74.
20 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.32, 147.34, 147.36, 147.63-147.65, 147.70, 147.75, 147.78, 147.83-147.85, 147.87 and 147.89-147.92.
21 See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 7.
22 Ibid., para. 11.
23 See www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=19842&LangID=E%20-%20sthash.oRpGJMmV.dpuf, and CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 12.
24 See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 10-12.
25 Ibid., para. 52.
26 Ibid., paras. 21-22.
27 Ibid.
28 See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 15.
29 See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 11.

[30] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 46-47.
[31] Ibid., paras. 12-13.
[32] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.155-147.156, 147.168 and 147.171-147.173.
[33] See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 24.
[34] See A/HRC/23/41/Add.3, para. 72. See also Fumie Saito, "Women and the 2011 East Japan disaster", *Gender & Development*, vol. 20, No. 2 (June 2012), p. 268.
[35] See A/HRC/23/41/Add.3, para. 76.
[36] See A/HRC/25/50/Add.2, para. 67.
[37] Ibid., paras. 35 and 68, and A/66/271.
[38] See A/HRC/25/50/Add.2, para. 68.
[39] See A/HRC/31/58/Add.1, paras. 42 and 63.
[40] Ibid., para. 74.
[41] See A/HRC/25/50/Add.2, para. 58. See also Shinzo Abe, "Japan's strategy for global health diplomacy: why it matters", *The Lancet*, vol. 382, No. 9896 (14 September 2013), pp. 915-916.
[42] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.93-147.113, 147.121-147.126 and 147.143-147.144.
[43] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 13.
[44] See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 15.
[45] Ibid., para. 7.
[46] Ibid., para. 11.
[47] Ibid., para. 13.
[48] Ibid., para. 10
[49] Ibid., para. 14.
[50] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 18.
[51] See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 22.
[52] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.44 and 147.116-147.120.
[53] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 18.
[54] See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 10.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid., para. 12.
[57] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 13.
[58] Ibid., para. 10.
[59] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.151-147.152.
[60] See A/HRC/35/22/Add.1, paras. 73-74.
[61] See UNESCO submission, paras. 6 and 17.
[62] See www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=19842&LangID=E%20-%20sthash.oRpGJMmV.dpuf.
[63] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 20.
[64] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 30-31.
[65] Ibid., paras. 18-19.
[66] Ibid., paras. 44-45.
[67] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 21.
[68] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.131-147.137.
[69] See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 19. See also, inter alia, A/HRC/22/14 and Add.1, paras. 147.145-147.148 and 147.158, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/5, para. 22, CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 38, E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 26 and CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 18.
[70] See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 19.
[71] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 28-29. See also, inter alia, CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/6, paras. 37-38, CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, E/C.12/JPN/CO/3 and A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.145-147.148.
[72] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 28-29. See also, inter alia, CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/6, paras. 37-38, CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, E/C.12/JPN/CO/3 and A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.145-147.148.
[73] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 18.
[74] See www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:3256111.
[75] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 14.
[76] See www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=19842&LangID=E%20-%20sthash.oRpGJMmV.dpuf.
[77] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 26-27.
[78] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 16.
[79] Ibid., paras. 16 and 18.
[80] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 15. See also www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:

13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:32560.

[81] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 26-27.

[82] See www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:3256111.

[83] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 16.

[84] See A/HRC/31/58/Add.1, para. 17. See also United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, *Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2014* (New York, 2014), p. 79.

[85] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 12.

[86] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.38, 147.43, 147.74 and 147.149.

[87] See www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Privacy/OL_JPN.pdf.

[88] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 12-13, and CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 8.

[89] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 12-13.

[90] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 25.

[91] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.32, 147.63, 147.69-147.70, 147.76 and 147.151.

[92] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 34-35.

[93] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 9. See also CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 34-35.

[94] See www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=1000:13100:0::NO:13100:P13100_COMMENT_ID:3174112.

[95] See A/HRC/23/41/Add.3, para. 44. See also Gabrielle Hecht, "Nuclear nomads: a look at the subcontracted heroes", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (9 January 2012), and "Nuclear power plants: a hidden world of untruths, unethical behavior", *The Asahi Shimbun* (Tokyo), 6 August 2012.

[96] See A/HRC/23/41/Add.3, para. 76.

[97] See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 17.

[98] Ibid., para. 17.

[99] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.32, 147.63, 147.91 and 147.161.

[100] See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 9.

[101] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 40-41.

[102] See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 22.

[103] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 14.

[104] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.32.

[105] See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 18.

[106] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.155.

[107] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 36-37.

[108] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 24.

[109] Ibid., para. 17, and CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 22.

[110] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, para. 38.

[111] Ibid., para. 39.

[112] See UNESCO submission, para. 15. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.154.

[113] See A/HRC/23/41/Add.3, para. 16. See also the final report of the Investigation Committee on the Accident at the Fukushima Nuclear Power Stations of Tokyo Electric Power Company, 23 July 2012, p. 11.

[114] See A/HRC/23/41/Add.3, para. 54.

[115] Ibid., para. 39.

[116] Ibid., para. 51.

[117] Ibid., para. 78.

[118] For the relevant recommendation, see A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.157.

[119] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 32-33.

[120] Ibid.

[121] See E/C.12/JPN/CO/3, para. 28.

[122] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 19.

[123] Ibid., para. 24.

[124] See UNESCO submission, para. 14, and A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.157.

[125] UNESCO submission, p. 5.

[126] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.73, 147.127-147.128, 147.130, 147.138, 147.142, 147.145-147.148 and 147.151-147.152.

[127] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 10.

[128] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 22-23.

[129] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 17 and CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, para. 22

[130] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 17.

[131] Ibid., para. 17.

[132] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.39, 147.79 and 147.126.

[133] See A/HRC/31/58/Add.1, paras. 41 and 74.

[134] See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 23. See also CRC/C/JPN/CO/3, para. 47.

[135] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 25.

[136] See A/HRC/31/58/Add.1, paras. 21, 33, 35 and 74.
[137] Ibid., para. 15.
[138] Ibid., para. 12. See also United States of America Department of State, "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2014: Japan" (June 2015).
[139] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.86 and 147.88.
[140] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 24-25.
[141] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 14.
[142] See UNESCO submission, para. 12.
[143] Ibid., p. 5.
[144] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.160-147.161.
[145] See CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, paras. 46-47.
[146] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 21.
[147] Ibid., para. 20.
[148] Ibid., para. 21.
[149] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 26.
[150] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 22.
[151] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.46 and 147.162-147.167.
[152] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 12.
[153] See CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, para. 19.
[154] Ibid., para. 19.
[155] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, paras. 12 and 23, and CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 9.
[156] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, paras. 12 and 23.
[157] See CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, para. 9.
[158] UNHCR submission, p. 2. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.46 (South Africa). Response No. 233 submitted to the House of Councillors by Mr. Shinzo Abe, Prime Minister of Japan, available at www.sangiin.go.jp/japanese/joho1/kousei/syuisyo/189/toup/t189233.pdf (in Japanese only).
[159] UNHCR submission, p. 3. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.166 (Sudan).
[160] UNHCR submission, pp. 3 and 5. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.46 (South Africa) and147.166 (Sudan).
[161] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.46, 147.78, 147.164 and 147.166-147.167.
[162] See CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, para. 23.
[163] UNHCR submission, p. 5.
[164] Ibid., p. 5.

United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/28/JPN/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
23 August 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-eighth session
6 – 17 November 2017

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Japan*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 37 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[2] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[3]

2. JWCHR called for early ratification of ICCPR-OP1.[4] JFBA JS5, AI and HRN recommended ratifying ICCPR-OP2, aiming at the abolition of death penalty.[5] APMM, JFBA, AI, JS9 and JS10 called for ratification without reservations to the ICRMW.[6] JS10 recommended accession to the 1954 and 1961 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons and the Reduction of Statelessness.[7]

3. JFBA was concerned Japan had not ratified the International Labour Organization Discrimination (ILO) Convention (No. 111).[8] JS9 recommended the ratification of the ILO Convention No. (97) (Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), Convention No. (143) (Migrant workers (Supplementary provisions) and Convention No. (111) concerning Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation.[9] JS11 called for ratification of

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

the ILO Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries No. (169).[10]

4. MINDAN and HRN called for the withdrawal of reservations on Article 4 (a) and (b) of ICERD.[11] JS9 called for withdrawal of the reservation to the ICESCR Article 8(1) d and 13(2), and Article 22(2) of the ICCPR.[12]

5. JFBA was concerned with Japan's reluctance to fulfill various treaty bodies' recommendations on the basis that it had no obligations to observe non-legally-binding recommendations, and that the Government cancelled the scheduled visit of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression at the last minute in 2015.[13]

6. CS urged inviting the Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples to visit.[14]

B. National human rights framework[15]

7. AI, JFBA, JS2, JS3, MINDAN and KHRF noted Japan had not established a National Human Rights Institution, and urged taking immediate steps to establish an independent, impartial and credible institution in accordance with the Paris Principles.[16]

8. CS urged Japan to create a National Action plan on implementing the rights of Indigenous Peoples based on the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples' Outcome Document.[17]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[18]

9. JFBA, AI, MINDAN and KHRF were concerned that a comprehensive anti-racial discrimination legislation was not yet drafted, and recommended its enactment to provide equal protection against discrimination for all persons on all grounds.[19] JS2 urged adoption of a comprehensive law with adequate and corresponding penal provisions and provision of human rights training to law enforcement officers to prevent hate speech, hate crimes and excessive use of force.[20]

10. AI, HRN, ACSILs and JS4 were concerned that despite enactment of an anti-hate speech law in 2016, it failed to ban advocacy of hatred or set any penalties.[21] JS4 called for measures to regulate hate speech and hate crimes by reviewing legislation.[22] JS4, HRN, MINDAN and AIPR, urged enforcement of the 2016 law in view of the existence of hate-speech or crime and to formulate legislation that restricts and punishes this behavior.[23] AIPR was concerned that hate speech directed towards Ryukyu people had increased sharply.[24] HRN was concerned hate speech was often xenophobic, with ethnically Korean and Chinese persons frequently targeted.[25]

11. MINDAN was concerned foreigners in Japan, including Koreans, face significant levels of discrimination particularly in the field of housing, employment and marriage.[26]

12. JS4 encouraged Japan to eliminate all forms of discrimination against Koreans and ensure a safe environment so that children of Korean origin can show their ethnic identity in public places and intensify measures to combat racial discrimination in the media. It also noted that hate speech and hate crimes against children attending Korean schools had

repeatedly occurred whenever tension between Japan and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea increased since 1980s.[27]

13. JFBA stated that no law prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity existed.[28] KHRF, AI and HRN reported some progress made to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientations of LGBTI, despite Japan failing to implement previously accepted UPR recommendations and continued to be concerned that discrimination against them continued in various forms.[29] KHRF stated that the Constitution prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, sex, social status or family origin, while excluding discrimination on sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status.[30] KHRF noted in 2012, Japan repealed Article 23(1) of the Basic Act for Housing, which previously excluded LGBTI couples from public housing rental. However, the amended law gave municipalities discretion in relation to public housing, resulting in continued discrimination. It also noted that no protections exist for LGBTI people under employment law. KHRF recommended enacting marriage equality law, to create a legally-recognized form of LGBTI partnership.[31]

14. JS13 was concerned that public awareness and understanding of LGBTI people remained low and urged measures to be taken to enact national laws that explicitly prohibit discrimination based on all grounds. It called for enforcement of the legislation prohibiting gender-motivated violence.[32]

15. AI noted discrimination against LGBTI people in accessing essential services such as health, legal and welfare. It recommended that Japan allow individuals to change their name and gender through a quick, accessible, transparent procedure, and in accordance with the individual's sense of gender identity, and abolish requirements to undergo psychiatric assessment and other medical requirements.[33]

16. HRW noted national law mandates people to obtain a mental disorder diagnosis and of other procedures, including sterilization to be legally recognized according to their gender identity. The current law contains a number of requirements that violate human rights and affect transgender children.[34] HRW and JS13 urged Japan to revise the Gender Identity Disorder Law, to replace humiliating mandatory procedures with self-identification criteria for legal gender recognition.[35]

Development, the environment, and business and human rights[36]

17. JFBA was concerned of business activities by Japan-based multinational corporations in countries with inadequate human rights legal protection, leading to human rights violations. It encouraged Japan to adopt a national action plan pursuant to United Nations guidance.[37]

18. IUVENTUM noted the state of emergency based on Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant Accident in effect from March 2011, allowing the Government to set the safety standard. Despite significant decontamination efforts, many locations were excluded from the procedures putting decontaminated spots at risk of re-contamination. In a recent report, the airborne radioactivity level in Fukushima was higher than elsewhere, nevertheless the Government was returning evacuees to the contaminated areas above 1msv/year radiation.[38] Greenpeace recommended dissemination of accurate, and easily accessible information regarding radiation and risk levels, and to reduce the acceptable additional annual exposure level in Fukushima-impacted areas to a maximum of 1 mSv/year, which would reflect the international standard.[39]

19. JS7 observed a misuse or abuse of budget formulation authority and was concerned that the government budget plan for Fiscal Year 2017 had a substantial reduction of about 6% for Ryukyu/Okinawa's development, compared with the initial budget for Fiscal Year 2016.[40]

2. Civil and Political Rights

Right to life, liberty and security of the person[40]

20. AI, HRW, HRN, JFBA and JS5 were concerned about the continued executions. Since Japan's 2012 UPR, the number of persons sentenced to death and executed had increased.[41] AI, HRN and JS5 regretted rejection of UPR recommendations to take steps towards abolition of the death penalty and establishment of an official moratorium on executions. Japan continued to refer to the majority public support for death sentences in cases of violent crimes as the reason for retaining the punishment and has stated that it has no plans to establish a forum to discuss the death penalty system. Additionally, a number of people with mental, psycho-social or intellectual disabilities had already been executed and others remain on death-row. They urged introducing a formal moratorium on executions and commuting all death sentences to terms of imprisonment as a first step toward the abolition of the death penalty and ensuring that conditions of detention complied with United Nations Standards.[42] JS5 reported that Japan's Penal Code does not limit the death penalty to the most serious crimes and urged amending it to crimes resulting in death in which the defendant had the intent to kill.[43]

21. JS5 stated that the "peace of mind" objective enshrined in Japan's legal code violates human rights of death-row inmates. It regretted that the laws and practices governing the prison system violated international norms and constituted cruel and unusual treatment, resulting in indefinite and prolonged solitary confinement of death-row inmates and in some cases barring confidential communications between inmates and their legal counsel. It thus encouraged Japan to conform to the revised Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.[44]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[45]

22. JS5 noted the weak legal system allowed for the possibility of wrongful convictions, confessions and executions with no mandatory appeal system for death sentences. Japan's lay judge system requires a majority of a nine-judge panel, and not a unanimous decision, to determine guilt and impose a death sentence. They recommended amending the Act on Criminal Trials with the Participation of Saiban-in to require unanimous decisions for verdicts of guilt and death sentences.[47]

23. HRN and HRW noted that pretrial detention could last up to 23 days. There is no pretrial bail, attorneys are not permitted in custodial interrogations and videotaping was limited, which raise the risks of police abuse and coercive self-incrimination.[48] HRN encouraged Japan to ensure custodial interrogation is videotaped, that a defendant's lawyer is present, and that prosecutors disclose all evidence.[49]

24. SJE stated that all Dutch nationals present in the Dutch East Indies, were subjected to cruelties committed by the Japanese Military and their enforced "allies" during World War II. SJE urged Japan to clear its past honorably and directly with the victims.[50] JWCHR urged Japan to restore the honor of those who were against the aggressive war and colonial rule, carried out by Japan under the pre-war Meiji Constitution and to apologize to the victims in accordance with international human rights laws.[51]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[52]

25. JWCHR reported that since October 2003, the Tokyo Board of Education has continued to order public schools to sing the national anthem under the national flag during school events, and has punished those who disobeyed, contrary to their rights to freedom of thought, conscience, opinion and expression. The song and the flag are highly controversial because of the roles they played before and during the Second World War. JWCHR urged

taking appropriate measures to make local governments refrain from coercing the national symbols at educational scenes.[25]

26. HRN was concerned about the attempted state control of media and journalism, that may impact its independence through suggestions that it could revoke licenses based on Article 4 of the Broadcast Act, which called on broadcasters to be politically neutral and not distort facts. It urged refraining from misapplying the Act and reviewing the Specially Designated Secrets Act "SDA".[26] JS2 noted interference and forcible removal of journalists reporting the protest activities in Henoko and Takae and recommended Japan to guarantee the independence of media and press freedom including through conducting human rights training for law enforcement officers. JS2 was concerned the Japanese police used oppressive and violent measures against protesters and encouraged Japan to ensure and guarantee the freedom of peaceful assembly and expression particularly in Okinawa.[27]

27. JLBA noted the State Secrecy Law jeopardized freedom of expression and the right to access information and urged Japan to repeal the law or fundamentally review it pursuant to international standards.[28]

28. JLBA and MINDAN stated that under Japanese laws, suffrage was limited to those who held Japanese nationality. They urged Japan to enact legislation to grant voting rights in local government elections to foreigners with permanent resident status.[29]

29. JS9 was concerned that fire fighters and prison officers had no freedom of association rights and there was a total ban on all trade union rights for these workers. Public servants had no right to strike, and those who call a strike faced the risk of dismissal, a large fine, or imprisonment of up to three years. Public servants have no collective bargaining rights. It urged Japan to make appropriate revisions to Article (52) of the Local Public Service Act and to Articles 108-2(5) and 98 (2) and 110 (1) of the National Public Service Law, to permit these workers to organize trade unions and allow participation in strikes and introduce effective systems to ensure the right to bargain collectively.[30]

Prohibition of all forms of slavery[31]

30. AI and IHOR were concerned about the 2015 final and irreversible 'Agreement on the Comfort Women'[32] and the continued denial of senior Japanese government officials and public figures of its existence even after the Agreement was reached. They recommended providing full and effective redress, reparation, and rehabilitative services, the issuance of official apologies, making adequate references in textbooks, and condemning any attempts to defame victims or to deny the events took place.[33]

31. JWJP was concerned that there are many cases of racial discrimination against Japanese in foreign countries, due to the issue of "comfort women", and urged Japan to take measures to protect their human rights.[34] JS6 urged Japan to end violence against women by fully accepting the crimes of its military in the past, and give full reparation to the victims/survivors.[35] IHOR expressed similar concerns including the lack of a comprehensive victim-centred approach, and the need for "full and effective redress and reparation" for all victims.[36]

32. GAHT-US and IHOR argued that in regard to the comfort women, attempts to defame Japan and Japanese were continuing in foreign countries.[37] GAHT-US stated that Japan is one of the safest countries, and is not subjected to any organized human trafficking in recent decades. It estimated about 20,000 women above the age of 18 recruited as comfort women were compensated.[38]

Right to privacy and family life[66]

33. AT noted that an online leak of sensitive information in 2010 revealed that Japanese police had been conducting systematic and extensive surveillance and information gathering activities targeting Muslims under the guidance of the National Police Agency. It called on the police to terminate this practice, provide anti-profiling training for law enforcement personnel and establish guidelines prohibiting profiling based on religion and national origin.[67] AI was concerned that in May 2016, the Supreme Court dismissed a case brought against the police practice of blanket surveillance of Japan's Muslim community. It urged Japan to ensure the rights of all persons to protection from unlawful communication surveillance, allowing only for distinctions and differences in treatment that are reasonable, objective and based on legitimate and overriding grounds.[68]

34. HRN urged Japan to cease surveillance of those cooperating with the United Nations and to implement the preliminary recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression.[69]

35. JFBA was concerned the new Social Security and Tax Number System showing the centralized management of personal information by the Government and companies may present a grave threat to the right to privacy, and additionally, urged Japan to legislate the use of surveillance cameras and to obtain geographic position information of persons by strict standards.[70]

3. Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[71]

36. JFBA noted the gender pay gap had not narrowed. It urged Japan to enact legislation to ensure the principle of equal remuneration for work of equal value and establish job evaluation based on international standards.[72]

Right to social security[73]

37. JFBA was concerned the tax and social security system was weak in redistribution of income, and did not adhere to the principle of affordable burden and that the relative poverty rate had increased to as high as 16.1 percent in 2012.[74]

Right to an adequate standard of living[75]

38. Greenpeace was concerned the Fukushima disaster resulted in an ongoing human security crisis especially for vulnerable groups. It considered the violations in the aftermath of the disaster as systemic policy failure and lack of legislative action on known issues. Greenpeace encouraged Japan to ensure survivors were fully compensated for their losses.[76]

Right to health[77]

39. IUVENTUM urged Japan to continue the current financial support for the voluntary evacuees of Fukushima disaster.[78] Greenpeace was concerned that the mental consequences were pervasive and potentially life-threatening, particularly for women and girls, who were also at a greater economic and political disadvantage from the current reconstruction policies due to their vulnerability to the health effects of radiation exposure.[79] HRN was concerned about children who were diagnosed with or believed to have thyroid cancer and urged improvement of health monitoring and services.[80]

40. JFBA was concerned no law stipulated patients' rights in Japan including the rights to receive safe, quality medical care and urged enacting relevant legislation.[81]

41. JS2 and JS14 were concerned that the United States (U.S.) military bases continued to cause grave health, environmental and social problems in Okinawa including "noise pollution", aircraft related accidents, and land contamination.[82] JS14 urged Japan to: conduct a survey on the safety of residents; to take effective measures, including the creation of "clear zones" at Futenma to protect and remedy the damage inflicted upon the local people; to approve on-site inspections in third country bases and training areas by the local government and civil society; to enact legal amendments necessary to protect the right of local residents to access water sources free from contamination; to conduct full-scale investigation of possible consequences of water contamination caused by constructing Self-Defense Forces (SDF) bases in the Miyako Islands and to publicize all findings.[83]

42. JS8 noted that the second-generation Atomic-bomb survivors were at risk from the genetic effects of radiation and that the survivors suffered from severe discrimination and social prejudice, urging that measures be taken to guarantee the human rights of victims.[84]

Right to education[85]

43. ACSILs called for inclusion of references to the historical existence of Lew Chew as an independent nation in textbooks.[86] JS7 and JS11 were concerned that education textbooks did not adequately reflect the history and culture of the Ryūkyūans, urging the government to provide appropriate opportunities to receive education in the language of Ryukyu/Okinawa.[87] JS7 recommended establishing an independent mechanism to monitor contemporary forms of discrimination against the people of Ryukyu/Okinawa.[88]

44. JS4 was concerned that minority children faced various difficulties given that the "miscellaneous schools", whereby minority children are educated in their own language, are not accredited as regular schools. In order to be accredited, the school has to fulfil the criteria, which is almost impossible, particularly if a minority community wants to educate and to use textbooks written in their own language. Graduates of Korean high schools also received unequal treatment with regard to access to higher education.[89] JS4 urged reviewing the legislation on school education to officially recognize foreign schools as regular schools, to ensure the right to education of minority children, and to recognize the Korean schools graduates' certificates as university entrance examination qualifications, on the same footing as other foreign schools.[90]

45. JS4, JFOR and LAZAK were concerned Japan excluded the students of Korean high schools from the "Tuition Waiver and Tuition Support Fund Program for High School Education".[91] JS4 and LAZAK recommended including Korean schools as recipients of this program and to invite local governments to resume or maintain the provision of subsidies to Korean schools.[92]

46. JFBA noted that the human rights treaties or discrimination issues were not incorporated in the curriculum guidelines for elementary to high school level.[93]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[94]

47. JS12 noted that the number of U.S. military personnel in Okinawa was 68.4% of the total of the U.S. Forces in Japan. It was concerned that since the arrival of the Forces in 1945, sexual assault cases targeting women had not stopped and continued to threaten the safety of the women of Okinawa. It requested Japan to conduct a factual investigation and announce results on the exact measures taken by U.S. Forces in a transparent way, particularly those in Okinawa, similar to the reform made to the Bonn Agreement to allow the appropriate country's police to carry out a proper investigation on behalf of the victims of sexual assaults committed by American military personnel.[95]

48. JFBA was concerned no discrimination law comprehensively prohibited discrimination against women, and that 23.7 percent of women had experienced spousal violence, since the revised anti-domestic violence law only applied to cohabitating couples.[96] HRN was concerned that marital rape is not explicitly criminalized and the age of sexual consent remains 13 years. Recently proposed amendments to the rape laws are grossly insufficient as the law falls behind international standards, and thus urged amending the Penal Code to expand the definition of rape and to criminalize all sexual conduct without consent.[97]

49. Greenpeace noted in relation to Fukushima catastrophe, women continued to be significantly underrepresented in decision-making, and thus called for equal public participation of women and development of support initiatives for financial independence.[98]

50. HRN was concerned women and girls were coerced into filming pornographic videos after being scouted as non-pornographic models or actresses. It urged intensifying efforts to eliminate sexual exploitation.[99]

Children[100]

51. JS1 was concerned about violence against children, and urged awareness-raising by both public and civil society bodies.[101]

52. JS1 and GIEACPC noted that corporal punishment of children was not yet explicitly prohibited by law in all settings except in school and was not explicitly prohibited in the alternative care setting and day care facilities, as well as the penal system.[102] GIEACPC recalled that Japan had accepted a second cycle UPR recommendation to explicitly prohibit corporal punishment in all settings, while the 2017 mid-term report of Japan responded vaguely saying that "while the meaning of "corporal punishment" is not absolutely clear, the act of assault (Penal Code Article 208) or injury (Penal Code Article 204) can be punished".[103] JS1 reported that the bill on amending the Child Welfare Act does not include provision to legally prohibit corporal punishment.[104]

53. JFBA was concerned that child abuse resulting in death continued, despite the measures stipulated in the Act for the Promotion of Measures against Bullying 2013. It urged prohibiting in its legislation corporal and other cruel or degrading punishment and to remove Article 822 (right to discipline a child) of the Civil Code, and raise awareness in this regard.[105]

Persons with disabilities[106]

54. JS3 noted that despite Japan's ratification of the ICRPD, new legislation and policies did not include persons with dementia, psychosocial and intellectual disability. It urged repealing the Mental Health and Welfare for the Mentally Disabled, implementing the comprehensive deinstitutionalisation plan for psychiatric hospitals, and establishing a monitoring system independent from the government.[107]

55. HRW regretted that no major reform had been proposed to address stigma against persons with disabilities despite enacting the 2016 Act on the Elimination of Discrimination against Persons with Disabilities.[108]

56. AI was concerned that a number of people with mental, psycho-social or intellectual disabilities had already been executed and other prisoners remained on death row who may suffer from similar mental conditions. It noted Japan did not have effective safeguards to avoid the application of the death penalty to those with serious mental or intellectual disabilities, nor did it regularly carry out psychiatric evaluations.[109]

57. JFBA noted with concern that the current healthcare system allowed excessive physical restraints and involuntary medication for mental disorders.[110] JS3 was concerned

that there were 300,000 patients in psychiatric hospitals - about 200,000 patients staying for over 1 year and over 36,000 patients staying over 20 years - that new coercive hospitalisation had increased by 2-3 times in two decades, and that about 40 percent of inpatients were subject to coercive hospitalisation.[111]

Minorities and indigenous peoples[112]

58. MINDAN and LAZAK were concerned that the Japanese Government had continually denied Korean residents were a national or ethnic minority as defined in Article 27 of the ICCPR or the United Nations Declaration on Minority Rights. Moreover, there were no measures taken for establishing the conditions necessary for protection and promotion of the cultural and linguistic identity of Korean residents.[113]

59. MINDAN called on Japan to establish a comprehensive basic law for protecting the rights of residents and their descendants from the former colonies of Japan, such as Koreans.[114]

60. AIPR, JS2, JS7 and JS11 were concerned Japan had neither recognized Ryukyuans as an indigenous people, nor taken measures to protect their traditional culture, history and language.[115] JS2, JS7 and JS14 urged Japan to recognize the people of Ryukyu/Okinawa as indigenous people, and to take concrete measures to protect their rights to their traditional land and natural resources, ensuring respect for their right to engage in free, prior and informed consent in policies that affect them.[116]

61. JFBA and IMADR were concerned that discrimination on the ground of "descent" against Burakumin, which is the largest minority community, remained in employment, marriage, and housing, etc. Racist groups repeatedly conduct discriminatory propaganda activities around Buraku areas. Incitement to discrimination is still rampant on the Internet. It called for the reinforcement of the Act on the promotion of elimination of Buraku discrimination considering the Personal Information Protection Commission opinion that those cases are not within the scope of the "sensitive personal information".[117] IMADR was concerned that women from minority/indigenous communities faced challenges such as: domestic violence, disparity in educational status within their community and in relation to women from the majority group. It urged measures to improve employment of indigenous and minority women, ensuring proper working conditions and providing assistance in finding decent jobs.[118]

62. IMADR urged Japan to provide counselors at the public consultation service with training tailored to conditions of victims from minority communities, as well as provide them with educational opportunities and support.[119]

63. CS stated that in recent years Japan has taken legal steps and measures in cultural areas to end systemic discrimination against the Ainu. It noted that measures in the Cultural Protection Act were not derived from the fact that the Ainu are an Indigenous Peoples, nor are they predicated on the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. It noted that Ainu individuals continued to suffer greater rates of poverty. It urged Japan to continue making strides to engage the Ainu people, and to promote the resurgent development of Ainu culture and heritage and ensure participation in decision-making.[120] JFBA called on Japan to implement comprehensive measures incorporating social, cultural, political, and educational perspectives, considering the Ainu's history as an indigenous people.[121] ACSILs urged Japan to immediately create anti-racial discrimination laws to protect indigenous peoples as well as provide thorough instruction on the right of indigenous peoples in the human rights curriculum of police academies.[122]

64. JS11 called on Japan to ensure that the history of Ainu and Ryūkyūans are properly represented in textbooks used in school curricula, as well as ensuring their rights were promoted and protected.[123]

65. JS11 noted Japan voted in favor of adopting the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, but did not recognize the unconditional right to self-determination.[124] JS14 and ACSILs were concerned that the Government is constructing new bases and facilities for the U.S. military and its SDF, despite local opposition. The construction of this new air base in Henoko and "helipads" for MV-22 Osprey aircraft in Takae in northern Okinawa Island impacted both the people living in those areas and the biodiversity-rich environment. The construction could also jeopardize the northern part of Okinawa Island's bid for UNESCO's World Natural Heritage status. They recommended to stop immediately the construction and start the immediate demilitarization and decolonization of Lew Chew.[125]

Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[126]

66. HRW regretted that weak legal protection for migrant workers resulted in abuses despite Japan accepting recommendations to protect their rights. Highlighting that the Labour Standards Bureau statistics in 2015 recognized 3,695 cases of labour standards violations, the highest since 2003.[127] AI and APMM called for policy reforms to ensure the human rights and dignity of migrant workers and members of their families, irrespective of their status, and that employers suspected of being responsible for abusing their rights were brought promptly to justice.[128]

67. AI and JFBA were concerned about reports, in relation to the Technical Intern Training Program (TITP), of sexual abuse, work-related deaths and working conditions amounting to forced labour and trafficking.[129] JS9 noted industries continued to use the TITP immigration scheme of low-skilled migrant workers under the misleading classification of 'interns', where in reality they performed key roles in vital sectors.[130] SMJ and APMM regretted that the TITP functioned as a measure to secure "extremely low cost labour" for small and mid-sized companies that suffered from labour shortage. In addition, they restricted workers' freedoms in their private lives, such as banning possession of mobile phones, preventing them from staying away overnight, or changing their receiving organization.[131] SMJ, JFBA and APMM urged reviewing and regulating the program to prevent human rights violations and enacting an anti-human trafficking law that covers the training program.[132]

68. APMM was concerned about increasing trends of abuses, exploitation, deceit, human trafficking, Government neglect and other human rights violations against migrants and recommended that the Government prosecute recruitment agencies, brokers and employers that exploited migrant workers and provide effective mechanisms to protect migrants and enact an anti-human trafficking law that will cover the training program and protect migrants from becoming victims of human trafficking. APMM stated that the abusive and exploitative condition besetting many marriage migrants in Japan resulted in a big number of single mothers, who take sole care of their children after they divorce their Japanese spouses.[133]

69. APMM was concerned about increasing trend of domestic violence and other human rights violations with regard to married migrants and recommended that Japan grant residency visas to foreign spouses of Japanese citizens without the letter of guarantee from their spouses currently required for granting such visas, and to criminalize spousal abuse and impose harsher penalties on perpetrators.[134]

70. MINDAN regretted that foreigners including former colonialized Koreans in Japan, were not eligible for various public positions. It called for the elimination of all legislation, administrative rules and practices which implicitly or explicitly prohibit foreigners from being promoted to managerial positions in local government offices.[135]

71. AI was concerned asylum-seekers waited for years in financial difficulty and uncertainty, not knowing whether they would be able to settle in Japan. A majority of Syrian refugees were unable to apply due to Japan's strict criteria, which excluded the most vulnerable who were in urgent need of protection, even after Japan announced in 2016 its aim of accepting up to 150 Syrian refugees over five years.[136]

72. AI urged Japan to ensure the refugee status determination process was conducted in a fair, effective and transparent manner in line with international law and standards, including the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.[137]

Stateless persons[138]

73. JS10 noted Japan has not established a statelessness status determination procedure or complementary protection mechanism from arbitrary detention. Stateless persons residing in Japan irregularly are at risk of arrest, detention and deportation. It urged Japan to: introduce the 1954 Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons definition of "stateless person" into Japanese law; establish a statelessness determination procedure that is fair, effective and accessible regardless of legal status; revise article 8(4) of Japan's Nationality Law (Revised Act No.70 of June 13, 2014) to ensure that all children born in Japan who do not acquire another nationality are automatically conferred Japanese nationality at birth; ensure that statelessness is considered to be a valid ground for granting "Special Permission to Stay"; and to ensure that all stateless persons who resided irregularly in Japan have the opportunity to regularise their status.[139]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.
Civil society
Individual submissions:

ACSILs	The Association of Comprehensive Studies for Independence of the Lew Chewans (ACSILs) Ginowan City, Ryukyu (Okinawa) (Japan);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom);
AIPR	Association of Indigenous Peoples in Ryukyus, Okinawa (Japan);
APMM	Asia Pacific Mission for Migrants, Hong Kong (China);
CS	Cultural Survival, Cambridge (United Kingdom);
GAHT-US-Corporation	GAHT-US-Corporation, Santa Monica (California) (U.S.A.);
GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom);
Greenpeace	Greenpeace Japan NF, Tokyo (Japan);
HMJR	Researcher of History on Modern Japan, Tokyo (Japan);
HRN	Human Rights Now, Tokyo (Japan);
HRW	Human Rights Watch;
IMADR	International Movement against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism, Tokyo (Japan);
IUVENTUM	IUVENTUM, (Germany);
JFBA	Japan Federation of Bar Associations, Tokyo (Japan);
JFOR	Japan Fellowship of Reconciliation, Wakayama (Japan);
JWCHR	The Japanese Workers' Committee For Human Rights, Toshima-ku, Tokyo, (Japan);
JWJP	Japanese Women for Justice and Peace, Tokyo, (Japan);
KHRF	Kaleidoscope Human Rights Foundation, Melbourne, (Australia);

LAZAK	Lawyers Association of Zainichi Koreans, Osaka, (Japan);
Mindan	Korean Residents Union in Japan, Tokyo, (Japan);
AT	Attorney Team for Victims of Illegal Investigation against Muslims, Tokyo, (Japan);
SJE/JES	Stichting Japanse Ereschulden /Foundation of Japanese Honorary Debts, The Hague (Netherlands);
SMJ	Solidarity Network with Migrants Japan, Tokyo, (Japan).
Joint submissions:	
JS1	**Joint submission 1 submitted by:** CAP Center JAPAN; Eyes for Children in Tokai; Fathering Japan; General Research Institute of the Convention on the Right of the Child; Human Rights Watch; Initiative for Ending Violence against Children Japan; Japan Network for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect; Japan Society of Physical Education, Health and Sport Sciences; 'miku'- Parenting Magazine; Momrings; MY TREE Parents Program Center; Network for the Convention on the Rights of the Child; Nippon Children Parents Supporter; NPO Palette CRC Supporting Center; Save the Children Japan; SBI Children's Hope Foundation; Support Center for Foster Families in Chiba; Tiger Mask Fundation;
JS2	**Joint submission 2 submitted by:** JNGMDP: Japan National Group of Mentally Disabled People; and WNUSP: World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry, Tokyo (Japan);
JS3	**Joint submission 3 submitted by:** JNGMDP: Japan National Group of Mentally Disabled People and World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry WNUSP, Tokyo (Japan);
JS4	**Joint submission 4 submitted by:** Human Rights Association for Korean Residents in Japan (HURAK) and the International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR);
JS5	**Joint submission 5 submitted by:** The Advocates for Human Rights, Minnesota (USA); The Center for Prisoners' Rights (Japan) and The World Coalition against the Death Penalty, Montreuil (France);
JS6	**Joint submission 6 submitted by:** Women's Active Museum on War and Peace (WAM), Tokyo (Japan) and Japanese Committee for Filipino "Comfort Women" (JCFCW);
JS7	**Joint submission 7 submitted by:** All Okinawa Council for Human Rights and International Movement Against All Forms of Discrimination and Racism (IMADR);
JS8	**Joint submission 8 submitted by:** Japanese Liaison Council of Second-Generation Atomic Bomb Survivors;
JS9	**Joint submission 9 submitted by:** The International Centre for Trade Union Rights (ICTUR), London, (United Kingdom) and National Confederation of Trade Unions (Zenroren);
JS10	**Joint submission 10 submitted by:** Institute on Statelessness and Inclusion (ISI) and Statelessness Network Asia Pacific (SNAP);
JS11	**Joint submission 11 submitted by:** Association of Indigenous Peoples in the Ryukyus (AIPR) Okinawa (Japan), Shimin Gaikou Centre (Citizens' Diplomatic Center for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples) Tokyo (Japan), Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP) Chiang Mai (Thailand), International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) Copenhagen (Denmark);

JS12	**Joint submission 12 submitted by:** Asia-Pacific Human Rights Information Center (HURIGHTS OSAKA), All Okinawa Council for Human Rights, Okinawa women act against military violence and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Kyoto (WILPF kyoto);
JS13	**Joint submission 13 submitted by:** Equality (Gay Japan News) Tokyo (Japan) and RC-NET, Aomori (Japan);
JS14	**Joint submission 14 submitted by:** Okinawa Environment Network, All Okinawa Council for Human Rights, Plaintiff Group for Third Lawsuit against Aircraft Noise of Kadena Airbase, Plaintiff Group against Aircraft Noise of Futenma Airbase, The Informed-Public-Project, Okinawa Environmental Justice Project, Tida no Fua Group to Make Peaceful Future for the Islander Children, Takahara, Okinawa City, (Japan).

[2] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR;
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights;
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR;
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty;
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women;
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW;
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT;
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child;
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict;
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography;
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure;
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families;
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities;
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD;
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

[3] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.2, 147.3, 147.1, 147.4, 147.5, 147.6, 147.7, 147.106, 147.112, 147.8, 147.9, 147.10, 147.24, 147.25, 147.26, 147.13, 147.11, 147.12, 147.15, 147.27, 147.28, 147.29, 147.30, 147.17, 146.18, 147.16, 147.20, 147.21, 147.22, 147.23, 147.19.

[4] JWCHR, page 1.

[5] JFBA, page 3, HRN, page 11. See also the Mid-term Report on the progress made in the implementation of the recommendations issued at the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review, Jan. 2017, https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/japan/session_14_-_october_2012/japan_mid-term_2nd_cycle_2017.pdf. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and 147.166 (Sudan). JS 5 page 8, para 32, AI, page 2 and 6. See also, A/HRC/22/14, recommendations 147.6 (Rwanda, Switzerland), 147.7(Uruguay), 147.8(Australia), 147.93 (Italy), 147.94(Namibia);

147.95 (Netherlands); 147.96(Norway); 147.97(Argentina); 147.98(Australia); 147.99(Mexico); 147.100(Italy); 147.101(Ireland); 147.102(Germany); 147.103(France); 147.104(Finland); 147.105(Norway); 147.106(Portugal); 147.107 (Slovakia); 147.108(Slovenia); 147.109(Spain); 147.110(Switzerland); 147.111(Turkey); 147.112 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and 147.113 (Austria).

[6] APMM, page 3, JFBA, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and 147.166 (Sudan); and AI, page 7, and JS 9, page 7, para 22 and JS10, page 5-6.

[7] JS10, page 5, 6.

[8] JFBA, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), and 147.166 (Sudan).

[9] JS 9, page 7.

[10] JS11, page 2, page, 6.

[11] MINDAN, page 13. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.160 (Germany), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), 147.163 (Myanmar), and 147.166 (Sudan) and HRN, page, 9.

[12] JS 9, page 7.

[13] JFBA, page 4.

[14] CS, page 6.

[15] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.47; 147.48; 147.49; 147.50; 147.51; 147.52; 147.53; 147.54; 147.55; 147.56; 147.57; 147.58; 147.59.

[16] AI, page 2 and 6, MINDAN, page 5, JFBA, page 3 and JS2, page 11 and 12, JS3, page 2 and 5, KHRF, page 3, and 5. See also, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.47. (Nepal); 147.48. (Spain); 147.49. (Nicaragua); 147.50. (Tunisia); 147.51. (Ukraine); 147.52. (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); 147.53. (Benin); 147.54. (Burkina Faso); 147.55. (France); 147.56. (Indonesia); 147.57. (Jordan); 147.58. (Malaysia); 147.59. (Mexico).

[17] CS, page 6.

[18] For relevant recommendations see, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.63; 147.89; 147.90; 147.85; 147.70; 147.84; 147.34; 147.36; 147.64; 147.65; 147.78; 147.32; 147.87; 147.91; 147.92.

[19] AI, page 6, KHRF, page 11 -12, MINDAN, page 5, and page 12 and 13 and JFBA, page 3. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.84(Namibia); 147.87(United States of America); 147.90 (United States of America).

[20] JS2, page 7.

[21] AI, page 3, ACSILs, page 5, HRN, page 7-8, JS4, page 6 and 9. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.36, 147.40, 147.60, 147.62, 147.64, 147.79, 147.161 and 147.165.

[22] JS4, page 6 and page 9.

[23] JS4, page 9, HRN, page 7-8, MINDAN, page 9,12 and 13, AIPR, page 6.

[24] AIPR, page 5.

[25] HRN, page 7-8.

[26] MINDAN, page 4-5, 9, 12 and 13. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.34 (Canada), 147.35 (South Africa), 147.36 (Switzerland), 147.37(Uzbekistan), 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), 147.63 (Cuba), 147.64 (Palestine), 147.84 (Namibia), 147.85 (Norway), 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), 147.92 (Tunisia), 147.160 (Germany), 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), 147.163 (Myanmar), and 147.166 (Sudan).

[27] JS4, page 6 and 9. See also CERD/C/304/Add.114, para. 14, CERD/C/JPN/CO/3-6, para. 13, E/CN.4/2006/16/Add.2, para. 90.

[28] JFBA, page 4.

[29] KHRF, page 4-5, AI, page 4, page 6 and 7 and HRN, page 2, JFBA, page 4.

[30] KHRF, page 4-5.

[31] KHRF, page 2 and 11.

[32] JS13, page 3 and 5.
[33] AI, pages 4, 6 and 7.
[34] HRW, page 2.
[35] HRW, page 2, JS13, page 5.
[36] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.83; 147.173; 147.155; 147.75; 147.152; 147.88; 147.156.
[37] JFBA, page 2.
[38] IUVENTUM, page 1 and 5. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.37(Uzbekistan); 147.40 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)); 147.63 (Cuba); 147.64 (Palestine); 147.84 (Namibia); 147.85 (Norway); 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea); 147.92 (Tunisia); 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); and 147.166 (Sudan). See also https://www.iaca.org/sites/default/files/mfa_information_170323_full_report.pdf.
[39] Greenpeace, page 4.
[40] JS7, page 5.
[41] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.126; 147.97; 147.98; 147.94; 147.100; 147.104; 147.105; 147.107; 147.108; 147.109; 147.110; 147.111; 147.101; 147.102; 147.103; 147.113; 147.93; 147.99; 147.121; 147.123; 147.124; 147.125; 147.95; 147.144; 147.145; 147.96; 147.122.
[42] AI, page 2. See also, Amnesty International, Death Sentences and Executions 2014, www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/0001/2015/en/ (Index: ACT 50/0001/2015); Amnesty International, Death Sentences and Executions 2015, www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/3487/2016/en/ (Index: ACT 50/3487/2016); HRW, page 4. See also A/HRC/22/14 Recommendation 147.95 (Netherlands); HRN, page 11; and JFBA, page 4-5. JS5, page 2. See also, JFBA. Declaration Calling for Reform of the Penal System Including Abolition of the Death Penalty, adopted at the 59th JFBA Convention on the Protection of Human Rights on October 7, 2016. (English) http://www.nichibenren.or.jp/en/document/statements/year/2016/161007.html.
[43] AI, pages 2 and 7, JS5, page 2-6, and HRN, pages 11 and 13. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.6 (Rwanda, Switzerland); 147.7(Uruguay); 147.8(Australia); 147.93 (Italy); 147.94(Namibia); 147.95 (Netherlands); 147.96(Norway); 147.97(Argentina); 147.98(Australia); 147.99(Mexico); 147.100(Italy); 147.101(Ireland); 147.102(Germany); 147.103(France); 147.104(Finland); 147.105(Norway); 147.106(Portugal); 147.107 (Slovakia); 147.108(Slovenia); 147.109(Spain); 147.110(Switzerland); 147.111(Turkey); 147.112(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and 147.113 (Austria). See also, Mid-term Report on the progress made in the implementation of recommendations issued at the second cycle of the Universal Periodic Review, Jan. 2017, https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/japan/session_14_-_october_2012/japan_mid-term_2nd_cycle_2017.pdf.
[44] JS5, pages 2, 5and 7.
[45] JS5, pages 6-8.
[46] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.44; 147.116; 147.117; 147.120; 147.118; 147.119.
[47] JS5, pages 2 and 8.
[48] HRW, page 4 and HRN, page 11. See also CCPR/C/JPN/CO/5. HRN 2008 UPR Report, id., at 2-3.
[49] HRN, page 11 and 12.
[50] SJE, page 2 and 4.
[51] JWCHR, page 5-6.
[52] For relevant recommendations see, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.152; 147.151.
[53] JWCHR, page 3-5. See also CCPR/C/JPN/Q/6 paragraph 22.
[54] HRN, page 5-7. See also, Japanese Constitution, article 21; United Nations Treaty Collection, "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights," article 19, https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-4&chapter=4&clang=_en.
[55] JS2, pages 4-5, 8 and 11.
[56] JFBA, page 7. See also, ICCPR. CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6 http://www.nichibenren.or.jp/library/ja/kokusai/humanrights_library/treaty/data/CO_JPRep6_ICCPR_140820.pdf. See also, OHCHR. Preliminary observations by the United Nations Special Rapporteur

on the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Mr. David Kaye, at the end of his visit to Japan (12-19 April 2016)
http://www.ohchr.org/en/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=19842&LangID=E.

[47] JFBA, page 7; MINDAN, page 6-7.

[48] JS9, page 2 and 6-7.

[49] For relevant recommendations see, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.136, 147.133, 147.135, 147.137, 147.131, 147.134, 147.132.

[50] AI, page 4, 7; JFOR, page 2-3; AI, page 4. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.145(Republic of Korea); 147.146(China); 147.147(Costa Rica); 147.158(Netherlands).

[51] JWJP, page 3 and 6. See also, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.51 (Zimbabwe); 147.60 (Jordan); 147.63 (Cuba).

[52] JS6, page 7. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.145 (Republic of Korea); 147.146(China); 147.147(Costa Rica); 147.158(Netherlands); 147.148. (Democratic People's Republic of Korea). See also the speech on March 10, 2016, during the 31st session of Human Rights Council: "Last year I highlighted the unresolved suffering, and search for justice, of the women who survived sexual slavery by Japanese military forces during World War II. Since then, in December 2015, the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea have announced a bilateral agreement to address the issue. Its terms have been questioned by various UN human rights mechanisms, and most importantly by the survivors themselves. It is fundamentally important that the relevant authorities reach out to these courageous and dignified women, ultimately only they can judge whether they have received genuine redress." See also, Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law (A/RES/60/147).

[53] HRW, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.147 (Costa Rica).

[54] GAHT-US Corporation, page 2; HMJR, page 2.

[55] GAHT-US Corporation, page 3.

[56] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.38, 147.43, 147.74, 147.149.

[57] Attorney Team, pages 1, 3 and 9.

[58] AI, page 3 and 7. See also The Asahi Shimbun, Compensation granted, regarding the case of leaked information on terrorism investigation by Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department), 2 June 2016, available at digital.asahi.com/articles/DA3S12369377.html.

[59] HRN, page 7. See Mandates of the Special Rapporteurs on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association, and on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders, [hereinafter "Mandates of the Special Rapporteurs"], UA JPN 4/2016, 30 May 2016, https://spdb.ohchr.org/hrdb/33rd/public_-_UA_JPN_30.05.16_(4.2016).pdf; see also Human Rights Council 2016 Report of the Secretary-General on Cooperation with the United Nations, its representatives and mechanisms in the field of human rights A/HRC/33/19, 16 Aug. 2016.
http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/SP/Pages/Actsofintimidationsandreprisal.aspx. Despite the Ministry of Foreign Affair's insistence that their internal investigation found the allegations to be baseless, HRN confirmed that FACTA has a copy of the memorandum. See HRN Statement on Independence of the Press, above note 37, at 5.

[60] JFBA, page 6.

[61] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14/Add.1, paras. 147.69, 147.76, 147.63, 147.70, 147.32, 147.151.

[62] JFBA, page 9. See also, OECD Stat "Real minimum wages"
https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=RMW.

[63] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.63, 147.32, 147.91, 147.161.

[64] JFBA, page 8. See also, MHLW Results of research analysis of the relative poverty rate and other factors, December 18, 2015, http://www.mhlw.go.jp/seisakunitsuite/bunya/hukushi_kaigo/seikatsuhogo/kekka_jyoukyou/chousa/tp151218-01.html.

[65] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14/Add.1, para. 147.32.

[66] Greenpeace, pages 1 and 4.

[67] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.155.

[68] JUVENTUM, page 1 and 2. See also, http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx. See also, http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/HRCouncil/RegularSession/Session23/A-HRC-23-41-Add5_en.pdf.

[59] Greenpeace, pages 1, 2-3. See also http://www.greenpeace.org/japan/Global/japan/pdf/Unequal-impact-en.pdf
[60] HRN, page 5.
[61] JFBA, page 10.
[62] JS2, page 7 and JS14, page 2.
[63] JS 14, pages 6 and 11.
[64] JS8, pages 3 and 4.
[65] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.157.
[66] ACMLs, page 4.
[67] JS11, page 3 and JS7, page 8. See also, (CERD/C/JPN/7-9), para. 21.
[68] JS7, page 8.
[69] JS4, page 1 and 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14 paras. 147.165 (Portugal); 147.36 (Switzerland); 147.64 (Palestine); 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); 147.60 (Jordan); 147.62 (Bhutan); 147.79(Uruguay); 147.36 (Switzerland); 147.64 (Palestine); 147.161 (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya); 147.60 (Jordan); 147.62 (Bhutan); 147.79 (Uruguay).
[70] JS 4, page 8-9.
[71] JS4, page 1, JFOR, page 7, LAZAK, page 8. See also, A/HRC/22/14 para. 147.91 (Democratic People's Republic of Korea).
[72] JS4, page 9 and LAZAK, page 3.
[73] JFBA, page 9.
[74] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.152; 147.151; 147.73; 147.147; 147.148; 147.145; 147.146; 147.130; 147.128; 147.127; 147.142; 147.138.
[75] JS12, page. 2 and 5.
[76] JFBA, page 4. See also, Gender Equality Bureau Cabinet Office. Survey on violence between men and women (Summary). March 2015. http://www.gender.go.jp/policy/no_violence/e-vaw/chousa/h26_boryoku_cyousa.html
[77] HRN, page 1, 3. See also, Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) "Concluding observations on the combined seventh and eighth periodic reports of Japan," UN Doc. CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8, 7 March 2016. http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=CEDAW/C/JPN/CO/7-8.
[78] Greenpeace, page 4.
[79] HRN, page 3.
[80] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.126; 147.39; 147.79.
[81] JS1, pages 5 and 6.
[82] JS 1, pages 2 and 4. GIEACPC, page 3. See also A/HRC/22/14, para147.126 (Hungary); A/HRC/8/44 para. 60.17.
[83] GIEACPC, page 1 and page 3-4. See also, A/HRC/22/14, recommendation 147.126. See also, CRC/C/15/Add.90, Concluding observations on initial report, paras. 24 and 45; CRC/C/15/Add.231, Concluding observations on second report, paras. 35 and 36; CRC/C/JPN/CO/3, Concluding observations on third report, paras. 7, 8, 47, 48, 56 an.157; CAT/C/JPN/CO/2, Concluding observations on second report, para. 23 and CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, Concluding observations on sixth report, para. 25.
[84] JS 1, page 3.
[85] JFBA, page 5-6.
[86] For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.88; 147.86.
[87] JS3, page 1, 2 and 4. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.86 (Armenia); (Act No. 123 of 1950, the last amendment in 2016 hereinafter MHA).
[88] HRW, page 1. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.16(Slovenia); 147.17(Spain, India, Iraq); 147.18(Kuwait); 147.19(Argentina).
[89] AI, page 2. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.6 (Rwanda, Switzerland); 147.7(Uruguay); 147.8(Australia); 147.93 (Italy); 147.94(Namibia); 147.95 (Netherlands); 147.96(Norway); 147.97(Argentina); 147.98(Australia); 147.99(Mexico); 147.100(Italy); 147.101(Ireland); 147.102(Germany); 147.103(France); 147.104(Finland); 147.105(Norway); 147.106(Portugal); 147.107 (Slovakia); 147.108(Slovenia); 147.109(Spain); 147.110(Switzerland); 147.111(Turkey); 147.112(United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and 147.113 (Austria). See also, International law and standards prohibit the use of the death penalty against people with mental and

intellectual disabilities. For instance, the former UN Commission on Human Rights urged States not to impose capital punishment on or execute "a person suffering from any mental or intellectual disabilities", UN Commission on Human Rights, Resolution 2005/59, Question of the Death Penalty, 20 April 2005.

110 JFBA, page 11.

111 JS3, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.86 (Armenia).

112 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14 paras 147.161, 147.160.

113 MINDAN, page 3; LAZAK, page 2.

114 MINDAN, page 3.

115 AIPR, page 2; JS2, page 2; JS7, page 3 and 7; JS11, pages 3-4.

116 JS2, page 11; JS7, pages 2 and 7; JS14, page 3.

117 JMAHR, page 2 and JFBA, page 9. See also A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.149(Bangladesh).

118 JMAHR, page 3, 4, and 5. See also, A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.72(Cuba), 147.160(Germany).

119 JMAHR, page 4 and 5.

120 CS, page 2, 5-7.

121 JFBA, page 4. See also CERD recommendation in 2014 (CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9).

122 ACMI.a, page 5.

123 JS 11, page 3.

124 JS11, pages 2 and 6.

125 ACMI.a, page 5 and JS14, page 3. See also A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.34 (Canada), 147.115 (Senegal).

126 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.164, 147.86, 147.167, 147.166, 147.162, 147.165, 147.163.

127 HRW, page 3. See also, A/HRC/22/14, para. 147.162 (Iran (Islamic Republic of)), and 147.163 (Myanmar).

128 AI, page 7 and APMM, page 5.

129 AI, page 6 and JFBA, page 10. See also, HRC, Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Japan, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, August 2014, and CERD Concluding observations on the combined seventh to ninth periodic reports of Japan, CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, September 2014.See also, Human Rights Committee, Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Japan, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, 10 August 2014, available at tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2FC%2FJPN%2FCO%2F6&Lang=en.

130 JS9, page 5.

131 SMI, page 1- 2 and APMM, page 2-3.

132 SMI, page 2, APMM, page 3 and JFBA, page 10. See also, HRC, Concluding observations on the sixth periodic report of Japan, CCPR/C/JPN/CO/6, August 2014.
CERD, Concluding observations on the combined seventh to ninth periodic reports of Japan, CERD/C/JPN/CO/7-9, September 2014.

133 APMM, pages 2 and 3.

134 APMM, page 3.

135 MINDAN, page 7 and 9.

136 AI, page 5. See also, Japan International Cooperation Agency, Japanese Initiative for the future of Syrian Refugees, available at www.jica.go.jp/syria/english/office/others/jsr.html.

137 AI, page 7.

138 For relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/22/14, paras. 147.78, 147.167, 147.166, 147.164, 147.60.

139 JS10, page 6 and 11.